DR. HAMPDEN'S

PAST AND PRESENT STATEMENTS

COMPARED.

OXFORD,
PRINTED BY W. BAXTER:
SOLD BY J. H. PARKER; AND BY MESSRS. RIVINGTON,
LONDON.
1836.

Copious extracts upon the topics here touched on having been already given, together with the context, in "Dr. Hampden's "Theological Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles com-"pared," it is thought sufficient once for all to refer to that pamphlet for such statements from Dr. Hampden's former works, as are not here particularly specified.

It will probably be expected, that those, who have so earnestly expressed their concern and alarm at the nomination of Dr. Hampden to the Regius Professorship of Divinity, should now again state whether his Inaugural Lecture has in any degree dissipated or mitigated those apprehensions. This, in itself, were no unreasonable expectation; for people naturally turn to a writer's last publication, to see whether the impressions made by the former are still conveyed by this. Dr. Hampden's advocates also appealed beforehand in his presence to this Lecture; this was the hearing which they claimed for him.

Two ways apparently lay open to Dr. Hampden; either to re-affirm the statements of his former works, and to endeavour to shew that they were not inconsistent with the teaching of our Church, nor led to the perilous consequences which were anticipated; or *openly* to retract them, and to express regret for the scandal which they had given.

Dr. Hampden has done neither of these, but, instead, has set forth a general popular statement of religious teaching, portions whereof are indeed in direct contradiction with what he before stated, but which, in many cases, does not even touch upon the questions, his treatment of which had raised such serious apprehensions. This proceeding is the more alarming, in that it was by the like recurrence to general terms, and the use of language akin to that of the Catholic Church, that the Arian heresy for a while escaped condemnation in the Western, and the Pelagian in the Eastern, Church, which were respectively less familiar with the language of each class of heretics.

Things then in reality remain just as they were: no theologian ever cast any imputation on the direct personal faith of Dr. Hampden, although many feared

that it, and much more the faith of those who should follow his teaching, would be ultimately endangered by the theological principles which he holds. Dr. Hampden, however, has vindicated his personal faith, which no one impugned; and his theological principles, the effects whereof were dreaded, he has left untouched.

With regard to the works already published, and upon which men's judgments were formed, Dr. Hampden admits occasional obscurity in terms, and so takes upon himself "some portion of the blame of being misunderstood," but casts the greater portion of the blame upon the misrepresentations of others, and takes as his comfort the words of "a far greater than the philosopher, 'Blessed are ye when men shall revile you.'"

The *plain* statements then of the Bampton Lectures and other works remain untouched and unrecalled; and these were they which excited so much just alarm: for the statements, wherewith Dr. Hampden impugned the received doctrines of the Church, were unhappily at all times too clear; (only some of us could not at first induce ourselves to believe that he meant to say so much as his plain words went to:) it was when he stated his positive views that he became obscure: as when he spoke of "certain sacred facts of Divine Pro-"vidence which we comprehensively denote by the "doctrine of a Trinity in Unity."

It may however be useful for those who have not read his previous works, to review, under the several heads of Christian doctrine, the subjects of men's alarm, and then to see in what degree that alarm may now be regarded to have been obviated.

THE HOLY TRINITY.

The misgivings with regard to Dr. Hampden's teaching upon this doctrine arose from its vagueness. He retained the language of the Church, in that he spoke of "the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity," and he

admitted that the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds excluded other forms *more obviously* (sic) injurious to the Christian Faith. (B. L. p. 378.) But he objected to the notions contained in them as unphilosophical and unscriptural (ibid.); he explained the mystery of the Trinity itself in Sabellian language[a]; asserted that "the differences of opinion thereon did not affect the Catholic Faith;" that "the Unitarians did not differ *in religion* from other Christians;" that "the whole discussion was fundamentally dialectical," "the peculiar phraseology, in speaking of the sacred Trinity as Three Persons and one God, established by dialectical science," that "no one could pretend to that exactness of thought whereon our technical language is based."

In the Inaugural Lecture, he explains or withdraws no one of these statements; but speaks of the "sublime and ineffable relation in which Jesus as the Christ indeed, stands to us as the only-begotten Son of God, who was with the Father and the Holy Spirit before all worlds, and coequal with Them in majesty, and glory, and holiness, taking upon Him our nature." (p. 7.) "If we know Jesus Christ, we believe in the full sense in which our Church has expressed it, Three Persons and One God, a Trinity in Unity, and an Unity in Trinity," and he states that he has been more and "more convinced, that the Trinitarian doctrine professed by our Church is the true one, that it cannot be denied without expunging the Scriptures themselves."

Now no one imputed to Dr. Hampden that he disbelieved the doctrine of the Holy Trinity in his sense, or that he did not accept the notions of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds *as less obviously* injurious to the simplicity of the Christian Faith than others; but they did object that his statements led to a vague apprehension of it, a dislike to the language of the Catholic Church as established at the Council of Nice, an hostility to the forms, which the whole Church

[a] See Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements, Preface, p. xx. xxi. xxiii.

had opposed as a bulwark against heretical speculation. Now this is not removed by his declaring *generally*, that he believes the Trinitarian doctrine received in our Church: and it is remarkable that in his own account of his belief, he precisely omits the word, whereon the whole controversy with the Arians turned. The whole Christian Church assembled at the Council of Nice saw the necessity of fixing the language "of one substance with the Father," (ὁμοούσιος) as that of the Catholic Church: the Church has consequently used it, and felt also the necessity of adhering to it to this day: whence our Articles say, "of *one substance*, "power, and eternity;" again, "the Holy Ghost is of "*one substance*, majesty, and glory."

To this language Dr. H. had in his Bampton Lectures objected, as "being settled by a philosophy "wherein the principles of different sciences were "confounded," and he now substitutes for this language, "coequal in majesty, and glory, and holiness."

I do not mean by this to imply that Dr. Hampden disbelieves, in his sense, the statement of the Church; nor that he would not use the word, when his attention is called to it, "as excluding other terms more ob-"viously injurious to the simplicity of the Christian "Faith." The Arian heresy in its original form has now long been silenced through the adoption of this very word; and a layman may well be excused, if he repeats the Nicene Creed without knowing the value of the word, which he utters; but in a professed Theologian, who had taken upon himself to criticise the language of the Church on this high doctrine, it does betray an unsound ignorance or indifference to the importance belonging to it, that, in a professed defence of his faith, he omits the very word, upon which the main controversy of the Christian Church with misbelievers turns.

It should be remarked also, that Dr. Hampden still refers to his Bampton Lectures, on the doctrine of the Trinity, as "speculative discussion, in which he "had in view to bring it home to the understanding,

" (so far as such a mystery could be brought home
" to the understanding,) *free from glosses and miscon-*
" *structions,*" and so, still recognizes those Lectures in the very point, in which they were objected to, as opposed to the teaching of the Church Catholic.

THE WORD OR SON OF GOD.

Our misgivings arose, in that Dr. Hampden maintained, that the orthodox language declaring the Son " begotten before all worlds, *of one substance* (sic) with the Father," was settled by a confused philosophy; that " materialism intruded itself into *what was considered* the Orthodox view of the Divine Proceeding;" that " there was much of the language of Platonism in the speculation;" that " the account of the Incarnation was more peculiarly logical, with a mixture however of physical speculation;" that " the received statements of doctrines were only episodic additions, some out of infinite theories, which may be raised upon texts of Scripture."

In the Inaugural Lecture, Dr. Hampden's positive statements are that " Jesus stands *to us in a sublime and ineffable relation* as the only-begotten Son of God, who was with the Father and the Holy Spirit before all worlds;" that " Christians, in the highest sense of the term," are " devout believers in the proper Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ." (p. 6.) Here again, by the way, Dr. Hampden has singularly missed the language of the Church, in that he has substituted the words " the only-begotten Son of God, who *was with* " the Father and the Holy Spirit before all worlds," for that of the Nicene Creed, " the only-begotten Son of God, *begotten* of the Father before all worlds, God of God," or of our Articles, " the Son—*begotten from everlasting of the Father*, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father." And yet the language which he has omitted, is just that limitation, which the Church adopted against heresy, and which he before opposed: he still speaks of " Jesus standing

to us in a sublime and ineffable relation as the only-begotten Son of God," as he before said, that it was " a *relative* Deity, revealed to us, when we learn that " there are three Persons in the Godhead."

It does not appear whether Dr. Hampden has tacitly retracted his objection to what he had before objected to as the result of " theory," (B. L. p. 231.) the statement that " our Lord assumed to his Divinity human nature itself;" he uses indeed the language of the Church, " took our nature upon him," yet explains not, whether he now accepts it, in the sense in which he before objected to it. We find him using the words of the Church, and nothing more. Yet even while employing the general language, " took our nature upon Him," he avoids what he before treated as a " mere question of logical philosophy," the language " of our Article affirming in Christ, ' two whole and perfect natures,' ' never to be divided.' "

Another statement, that our Lord " condescended" (in modern language " accommodated himself") to the [erroneous] prejudices of his followers, remains as before.

ATONEMENT.

Our fears on this head, again, arose from Dr. Hampden's *explanations* of the doctrine: he spoke of it before, as a " real atonement for sin;" (Obs. p. 26.) but when he came to explain what he meant under this term, it related only to " *human agency.*" " Christ died," it was said, solely " that *we might know* (sic) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that our own hearts might not condemn us," but that we " may not attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done:" in other words, whereas our Articles say " Christ truly suffered to reconcile His Father to us," Dr. Hampden says, that " He died, in order that *we* might be reconciled to God."

In the Inaugural Lecture, Dr. H. speaks of the

"atoning Saviour," (p. 6.) of Jesus Christ's "submitting to sufferings and death on the Cross for our sins," (p. 4.) "stooping to the humiliation of our manhood, and so becoming a meet sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world."

This is again the *language* of our Church, which Dr. Hampden as a member of it cannot but use; but what he means under this language, he leaves unexplained, or whether he understands any thing more than when he explained the Atonement to relate to "*human agency*," (and that, as opposed to the "gloss "of Commentators, or the refinements of Theorists,") and objected to the Church's doctrine of "expiation, "as depressing the power of man too low." The objective, intrinsic reality of the Atonement was impaired both by his objections to the Catholic belief in the doctrine, and his advocacy of a scheme, whereby the Atonement became subjective only, the reconciliation to God, which, through Christ's death, took place in each human mind that received it. This a Socinian would, in his sense, hold; and our difficulties are not removed by the simple unexplained repetition of the words of our Formularies. And yet he was publicly called upon, some weeks before the delivery of his Lecture, "for the sake of his hearers and readers," to explain his statements [b].

ORIGINAL SIN.

Man's actual tendency to sin was admitted by the Pelagians, (and indeed by the Heathen,) as well as by the Church: the Pelagians denied, and the Church asserted, its natural propagation, and consequently its existence in infants: herein Dr. Hampden sided with the Pelagians against the Church; asserted, that "the term 'propagation,' ('propagati,' 'engendered,' "Art. IX.) was *introduced in order to prove* the uni-

[b] Elucidations of Dr. H.'s Theological Statements, pp. 11, 18, 19, 26, 28, 29.

"versality of evil," that "a positive deterioration of "our nature was a scholastic notion;" that "the "strength of the expression, 'very far gone from origi-"nal righteousness,' was to be estimated by com-"paring the fallen condition of man with that tran-"scendent holiness which, in the scholastic notion, "was man's first estate;" that "our Article on this "subject contained a train of thought, following the "speculations of the Schools."

In the Inaugural Lecture, Dr. Hampden says he does "not see how any one who holds rightly the "Incarnation and Atonement of our Lord can look "at *his own* nature, otherwise than, in the language "of the Article, very far gone from original righteous-"ness, and 'corrupt' in the strictest sense of the "term," that "when we find this Divine Expiation "provided in the counsels of the Almighty at the "transgression of the first man; surely we must ac-"knowledge, as it is simply declared in Scripture, the "depth of the root of that sinfulness for which the "Redeemer came to atone." (p. 13.)

Herein Dr. Hampden still leaves it unexplained whether by "our *own* nature," he means our nature as we have corrupted it by actual sin, or our nature as deriving an hereditary taint through our natural descent from Adam: accordingly, he explains not whether he retracts his former statements, or still sides with the Pelagians.

FAITH AND GRACE.

Dr. Hampden had before stated, among other things, with regard to FAITH, that the "*priority*, which is "ascribed in such strong terms in our Articles to "Faith, among the acts of the Christian life, is ac-"counted for by the *physical* notion of faith as an "*infused* principle, the *origin* of a new life, held by "the Schoolmen." (B. L. p. 236, 7.) And that "Faith ought to have been held in a negative sense "only." (p. 238.) Of GRACE he had condemned the

" positive sense" as " something that admits of defi-
" nition and distribution into its various kinds," and
its " subdivisions of 'preventing' and 'following' Grace,
" Grace ' operating' and ' co-operating,' " (p. 188.)
as " derived from Scholasticism," (B. L. p. 188.) and
remarked " how erroneous is the conception produced
" in the mind by speaking of Grace operating and
" co-operating, Grace preventing and following."
(p. 187.)

In the Inaugural Lecture he says, (p. 12.) " If
" we believe in the Atonement of a Divine Redeemer,
" and the sanctification of a Divine Comforter, we
" cannot but be cordially disposed to receive the doc-
" trines of Justification and Faith, of preventing and
" co-operating Grace. . . . . God by His preventing
" Grace putting into our hearts good desires; by His
" co-operating Grace enabling us to bring the same to
" good effect."

Herein we have with regard to GRACE a direct, as to FAITH an implied, contradiction. Which statement are we to take? or how is such unexplained contradiction to satisfy us with regard to the future teaching of those committed to our care?

THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

Dr. Hampden had before stated that " the doctrine
" of the Sacraments was a Christianized form of the
" mystical philosophy of secret agents in nature,"
that " the ready reception of the theory of the Church
" was accounted for by the general belief of magic, in
" the early ages of the Church," that " the notion
" that Sacraments are visible channels, whereby vir-
" tue [or " grace," B. L. p. 312.] is conveyed from
" Christ to his mystical body, the Church, was part
" of the theoretic view of the Scholastic Philosophy,"
that " the whole doctrine and ritual of the Church of
" Rome, might be drawn from this primary notion of
" sacramental efficiency," that " the seven Sacra-
" ments of the Church of Rome were deduced in just

"logical connection with that original theory," that "the faith of the Receiver was the true *consecrating* "principle of the Sacraments."

On BAPTISM especially, he had stated the opinion of the Church (as implied in her formularies), viz. that the use of "water" and the words "in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," are *essential* to the Sacrament, "to be derived from the subtle "speculations about matter and form, introduced to "establish and perfect the theory of instrumental "efficiency ascribed to the rites themselves," that "Conditional Baptism was a scholastic provision," "the doctrine of vicarious faith in the administra-"tion of Baptism to infants a scholastic notion, an "effectual means of power to the Church" (B. L. p. 324, 5.); "the decision on the intrinsic efficacy of the "rite" to be "only speculation;" that "the use of the "terms 'incorporated' into the Church and being made "a 'member of the body of Christ,' as equivalent, was "owing to the *confusion of ideas* prevalent in the "early Church on the subject of Baptism."

On the LORD'S SUPPER he had said, that "the "assertion of a real and true presence of Christ in the "Eucharist resulted from the original Platonism of the "Church."

In the Inaugural Lecture, he speaks of BAPTISM as "the mystic sign and seal of our regeneration," (p. 7.) that we were therein "consecrated to God in the "name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy "Ghost," that we then "commenced our Christian "condition as the creatures of God the Father, the "redeemed of God the Son, the sanctified of God the "Holy Ghost," (ib.) that 'we know that God loves "us, because He is the Father of Jesus Christ and the "Giver of the Spirit, because He has created us again "in His Son:" that "our Saviour has sanctified "water to the mystical washing away of sin, by de-"claring that 'except a man be born of water and of "the Spirit,' &c., and by an express promise that 'he "that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.' We

"cannot doubt, therefore, the efficacy of Baptism "among the means of grace." Again, "our Church "in virtue of Christ's promise regards the baptized as "regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's "Church." (p. 14.)

With regard to the Holy Eucharist, he states that "our Church holds a *real* vital presence of Christ in "the Sacrament," that "forbidding us to hold the "doctrine of a corporal presence" it "does not presume to overlook the strong words of Christ, declaring 'this is my body,' 'this is my blood,' and 'he "that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth "in me and I in him;' and will not therefore incur "the impiety of employing this holy Sacrament of its "gifted treasure of grace[a]." (p. 14, 15.)

These are, indeed, in many respects, the words of our Church; some of the phraseology is in truth very vague; as, that we "are consecrated to God in the "name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy "Ghost," is language resembling that of the Baptists, who speak of "consecrating their children to God," even while they refuse them the Sacrament of Baptism. What again is meant, by "consecrating a child *to God*, "*in the name of the Father*, &c.?" And in what meaning are we to combine his use of the words of our Church with his late direct contradiction of them? how are we to reconcile his present admission of the "efficacy of "Baptism among the means of grace," with his former urgent opposition to the belief that the Sacraments were channels or instruments of grace? or how his present acquiescence in the Church's assertion of a "real presence of Christ in the Eucharist," with his former position that this "assertion was derived from "Platonism?"

[a] Cf. B. L. p. 320, where the fear of "evacuating the Sacra-"ment of its holy burthen of grace" is apparently stigmatized as leading to Scholastic theories.

HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The following are some of the propositions before formed from his works:

That it was "an improperly-directed veneration for the "text of Scripture in the Schoolmen, to receive Scripture, "not simply as the living Word of God, but as containing "the sacred propositions of inspired wisdom," and that thus "while they set themselves to gather up the fragments of "revealed truth," they "lost the opportunity of feeding on "the bread of God which came down from heaven." (p. 91.)

That "to make it our business, to collect into one theory "every scattered intimation of the Divine Being and attri-"butes, is the result of a false view of Scripture, as having "God for their proper subject." (p. 89.)

That "no conclusions of human reasoning, are properly "religious truths," but only "pious opinions." (Observ. p. 8, 14.)

That "a fundamental characteristic of the Christian Scrip-"tures, totally precludes all deduction of speculative (or intel-"lectual, or theological) conclusions, concerning religious "truth." (Observ. p. 13.)

That "by means of what was termed in the Schools the "analogy of faith, the Bible lost its most important charac-"teristic in the comparison with other assumed revelations." (B. L. p. 88.)

He objected also to the practice of "adducing text "after text from an Epistle, in which it was con-"tended that some dogmatic *truth*, some theory, or "system, or peculiar view of Divine truth, is asserted;" requesting it might be "considered, whether it was "not by such a mode of inference from the Scripture-"language, as would convert the Epistles into textual "authorities on points of controversy, that the very "system of the Scholastic theology was erected." (B. L. p. 375); maintaining that "texts, *as texts*, "prove nothing," (Obs. p. 15. first ed.); and stigmatizing, as a "common prejudice" without "foundation," the principle "which identifies systems "of doctrine—or theological propositions methodi-

"cally deduced and stated—with the simple *religion* "of Jesus Christ." (Obs. p. 3.)

Dr. Hampden now says:

"It (private reason) must compare Scripture with Scrip-"ture, and so gather up the fragments of truth scattered "throughout the sacred volume, and put them together. "This is a perfectly legitimate employment of reason. It is "a very different process from that of the speculatist, who "selects certain abstract notions, and frames definitions, and "argues from them what must be the truth of Revelation. "The true Christian inquirer uses his reason to the utmost "in interpreting what he reads in Scripture. He reasons, "and concludes, and judges, but he does not speculate. He "pursues what is called the analogy of faith, analysing and "combining the passages of Scripture, and so forms a com-"prehensive scheme of religious truth from the Bible." . . . (p. 23.)

Now, again, it seems needful to ask, How can these stand together? How is this statement to be reconciled with his former objection to "all deduction of conse-"quences" as "irrelevant to the establishment of "religious doctrine?" (B. L. p. 54.) How, with the position, that, though it was "hardly possible to avoid "*speculating or reasoning* on the given truths of Scrip-"ture," no right intellectual, speculative, or *theo-"logical* truth could result;" that no "*conclusions of "human reasoning*, however correctly deduced, how-"ever logically sound, are properly *religious truths;*" nay, that these "intellectual, or speculative, or *theo-"logical conclusions*, have been the fruitful source of "controversy, and error, and heresy, in the progress "of Christianity?" (Observ. p. 8, 13, 14.)

Here, then, are two views directly opposed to each other; which is it likely that young men will take, that which binds them to authority and received notions, or that which directly sets them free from it, and from the "cumbrous machinery" of "a meta-"physical and logical theology," (B. L. p. 380,) and holds out the hope that thereby "the sacred truth"

might be " allowed to stand forth to view, in its own " attractive simplicity?" (ib.)

Creeds and Articles.

The same question recurs here. Dr. Hampden now declares, that the Church " interposes *usefully* " with her Creeds, and Articles, and Homilies, and " Liturgy, and Canons;" that he is satisfied in his own mind " that they have been of essential use *for* " *maintaining the Christian religion in its integrity*, in " holding together the faithful in fast communion, in " keeping the *unity* of the Spirit in the bond of " peace." " Under this conviction," he says, " how- " ever freely I may have discussed the abstract *phra-* " *seology* in which they are expressed, I have said " whatever I may have on any occasion said con- " cerning the Creeds and Articles of the Church. . . . " Have they guarded and inculcated the truth as it is " written? This is the question with regard to them. " I firmly believe that they have done so, by the " watchful superintendence of Christ over his Church; " and I therefore esteem them very highly for their " work's sake, though they have wrought that work " by the hands of fallible men, and amidst all the " imperfections of human language." (p. 19, 20.)

Dr. Hampden's charge, however, against the Creeds and Articles related not (as he here implies) to their *phraseology* simply, but to their substance, to their " speculative or theological conclusions," " the un- " scripturalness of the notions on which their seve- " ral expressions were founded," " the *unsoundness* of " the metaphysical and logical theology" contained in them, " the speculations of *false* philosophy, which " intermingled with them," and upon which the most sacred truths were based; these he pronounced to be not the bond of union, but " the fruitful source of " controversy, and error, and heresy," maintaining that " theological opinion ought not to be the bond of " union of any Christian society," and that " the

" real *unity* of the Church is, after all, an invisible " one."

The following propositions out of a number formed from his works might suffice:

It is these " speculative or theological conclusions," such as we find in " all articles of religious communion," which have " been the fruitful source of *controversy* and *error* and " heresy in the progress of Christianity, and against which " accordingly the zeal of every lover of the simple faith, as it " is in Christ Jesus, ought to be directed." (Observ. p. 13.)

" Experience proves," that " the naked *truth* of God has " been *overborne* and *obscured* by the *phraseology* which the " Orthodox were forced to employ." (B. L. p. 377.)

" The *notions* on which the several expressions of the " Articles at large, and in particular of the Nicene and " Athanasian Creeds, are *founded*, are both unphilosophical " and *unscriptural*;" their terms belong to " ancient theories " of philosophy, and are only less obviously injurious to the " simplicity of the Faith, than those which they exclude." (p. 378.)

" The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds involve scholastic " *speculations*," they are " *logical* definitions of the high " subject of which they treat." (p. 544.)

" The *speculative logical* Christianity which survives among " us at this day, has been in all ages, the principal obstacle " to the *union* and peace of the Church of Christ." (p. 53.)

" I would once more call attention to the divine part of " Christianity, as entirely distinct from its episodic additions. " Whatever may have been the motives and conduct of suc- " cessive agents employed in its propagation, whatever may " have been the speculations of false Philosophy on the facts " of Christianity; those facts themselves are not touched." (p. 390.)

" Assuming that the Holy Spirit has not been unfaithful " to his charge over the Church of Christ, I have endeavoured " to take some account of that *resistance* which the human " agent has opposed to the diffusion of the *truth* as it was " divinely inspired. . . . As in the natural world, corruption " and disease may mark for their own the fairest works of the " Divine hand, but cannot unmake them; so neither are we " to suppose, that the superintendence of Christ over his " Church no longer exists, because the fields of his vineyard " have been overrun with thorns and weeds." (p. vi. viii.)

" The real unity of the Church is, after all, an invisible

" one. It is the communion of saints; the union of Chris-
" tians with the Holy Spirit himself. And it is not for us to
" trace his path minutely . . . all that we ought to say of our
" own profession is, in the spirit of St. Paul's expression,
" Such is our 'judgment,' and we 'think also that' we 'have
" the Spirit of God.' " (Observ. p. 28.)

THEOLOGICAL LANGUAGE.

Dr. Hampden expresses his regret, that his use of the word FACT to designate Christian truths has been misconceived. It was, he believes, founded upon a passage of Bp. Butler, who speaks of doctrines as being " matters of fact," and says, that " precepts " come under the same notion."

" I have no wish," adds Dr. H. " to retain a phraseology
" which is not generally understood. But I think it has no
" real difficulty in it, to persons at least accustomed to
" philosophical terms. All such persons know that *fact* in
" philosophical language is not restricted to something *done*
" (sic), though it denotes such a thing in its primary sense;
" but means in general *whatever is* (sic). I employ the term
" to express the *reality* (sic) which belongs to Christian
" truths as they are matters of Revelation, *as they exist in*
" *the Scriptures themselves*, where they are not so much matters
" taught, or truths stated systematically, as they are matters
" revealed. 'Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.'
" 'This is a true saying, &c.' 'God is Love.' Here are
" several *propositions* which as parts of the Scripture *Reve-*
" *lation* are realities of the kingdom of grace, or facts, as I
" term them; when however, they are taken out of Scripture
" and taught in the same, or equivalent expressions, as parts
" of a system of Christian truth, they are more properly
" doctrines." (p. 32, 3.)

Yet the sense given by Bp. Butler, and that now adopted by Dr. Hampden, are fundamentally at variance with that which lies as the basis of all the statements of the Bampton Lectures. Dr. H. now says, " Fact means *whatever is* (sic), and is not in philosophical language restricted to something *done*" (sic). Before, he as distinctly, and positively restricted the word to that, to which he now says, in philosophical language it is not to be restricted—the doings, or

actions, or providences of God. This distinction is of immense importance: for (if one may speak reverently on such a subject) "the eternal Generation of the Ever-Blessed Son," "the Procession of the Holy Ghost," "the Consubstantiality of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity," are, in that sense, "facts;" but, as Dr. Hampden before uniformly restrained the word to *doings*, and *actions*, and *providences* of God, and His *Agency in the world* and the *history* of Divine Providence, they were not "facts." And yet it was upon this assumption, that "the Divine part of Scripture was its facts," and that these facts "formed part of the great history of mankind," that Dr. Hampden's whole theory was based. It was on this distinction that so much of Christian doctrine was cast aside as speculation.

There are then two distinct uses of the word *fact*, one unobjectionable perhaps, but inapplicable; the other applicable, but objectionable. In the one sense, it excludes what Dr. H. calls the "episodic additions to the facts of Christianity," but therewith they exclude also the main Articles of the Christian Faith; in the other, all doctrines are facts, and so also the "episodic and Scholastic additions," which it was the one object of the Bampton Lectures to remove. Dr. Hampden must (in the hurry of which he complains) have forgotten the sense in which he employed it: he obviously could not have intended to apply it in the one sense, and to defend it in the other.

The following passages illustrate his past use of the word "*fact*."

"The real state of the case in regard to our Scriptures is, "that *the whole revelation* contained in them, so far as it is "revelation, consists of *matter of fact*. Either we have direct "and continuous history, acquainting us with the being, "providences, and mercies of God, *as the occasions of the* "*world have presented them to our view;* or we have pre-"dictions of his conduct, as it would appear on certain future "*occasions;* or, as is the case in the didactic and devotional "portions, reflection on the Divine *agency in the world,*

" and application of [*the instances of* first ed.] *his provi-*
" *dences*, whether already disclosed or foretold in prophecy."
(Observ. p. 13, 14.)

" I venture to say, there are no *propositions* concerning God
" in Scripture, detached from some *event* of Divine Provi-
" dence to which they refer, and on which they are founded.
" Some perhaps will say, ' An inspired writer has said thus, or
" ' thus—this then, as asserted by him, is matter of *fact*, and
" ' accordingly it is on matter of fact in this sense of the ex-
" ' pression that the Christian revelation is said to be founded.'
" The expression ' matter of fact' will no doubt admit this
" sense. But to interpret the Scripture *revelation* in this
" manner, is only to return to the assertion of its dogmatic
" character under another form. It brings us back, to take
" the words of *propositions* written by the inspired writers as
" the *substance of the revelation*, instead of looking to *the*
" *authenticated dealings of God in the world.*

" When I say, therefore, that the Christian *revelation* is
" matter of *fact*, I intend by it, to express my conviction,
" that the substance of the revelation is the *doings* and *actions*
" of God; I have always before my view, some *event* in the
" *history* of God's *providences* to which I refer it. In this
" sense, the truth concerning God is independent of any
" particular *wording* of it—its proper divine character is ex-
" empted from all alloy which the imperfection of the writer,
" the peculiarity of his circumstances, or the idiom of lan-
" guage, may accidentally infuse into it. In this sense, texts,
" *as texts*, (sic) prove nothing; texts establish Divine truths,
" only as indices to *real facts*, in the *history of Divine Pro-*
" *vidence.*

" Now this two-fold character of the Scripture—it being
" partly historical, partly didactic—serves at once to direct
" and limit our information concerning God . . . All that is to
" be inferred from the Scripture notices of him, he has already
" drawn out for us—in the expositions, reflections, and pious
" effusions of prophets, evangelists, and apostles.

" Let us then attend to the sort of commentaries, or infer-
" ences, or reflections, made by the inspired writers on *the facts*
" *of Divine Providence.* Are they not exclusively of a *practical*
" nature? Examine the Epistles of St. Paul, and see whether
" these energetic documents of an apostle's faith in his Saviour
" and love for his converts and brethren, have not been abused
" —when they have been treated as *doctrinal* expositions,—
" and not as ardent exhortations to Christian *duty*. . . . In
" fact, there is no other great doctrine preached by him, but
" what himself declares, when he says, ' We preach Christ

"crucified.' It is the *collection* of *facts* involved in that "general expression, 'Christ crucified,' which is the sum and "substance of his writings. The rest is enforcement of this "on the minds and hearts, first of the persons immediately "addressed, and subsequently of the whole Christian world." (Observ. p. 14—16. first edition.)

"Strictly to speak, in the Scripture itself there are *no* "*doctrines*. What we read there is matter of *fact*: either "fact nakedly set forth *as it occurred*; or fact *explained* and "elucidated by the light of inspiration cast upon it. It will "be thought, perhaps, that the Apostolic Epistles are an ex-"ception to this observation. . . . The Epistles clearly imply "that the work of Salvation is *done*. They repeat and insist "on its most striking parts; urging chiefly on man, what "remains for him to *do* (sic) now that Christ has *done* all "that God purposed in behalf of man, before the foundation "of the world. . . . Let the experiment be fairly tried . . . "whether the *practical*, or the theoretic, view of the Epistles, "is the correct one. . . . The speculating theologian will per-"haps answer, by adducing text after text from an Epistle, in "which he will contend that some dogmatic truth . . . is as-"serted. But 'what is the chaff to the wheat?' . . . And I "ask whether it is likely that an Apostle would have adopted "the form of an epistolary communication, for imparting "mysterious *propositions*. . . . whether, in preaching Christ, "he would have used a method of communicating truth, "which implies some scientific application of language—an "analysis, at least, of *propositions* into their terms—in order "to its being rightly understood? And I further request "it may be considered, whether it was not, by such a "mode of inference from Scripture-language, as would con-"vert the Epistles into textual authorities on points of con-"troversy, that the very system of Scholastic Theology was "erected?" (B. L. p. 374, 5.)

"I would once more call attention to the *divine part* of "Christianity, as entirely distinct from its episodic additions ". . . the FACTS of Christianity. These *facts* form *part* of "the *great History of mankind*: they account for the present "condition of things *in the world*: and we cannot deny them "without involving ourselves in universal scepticism. . . . "These, and other truths connected with them, are not "collected merely from *texts* or *sentences* (sic) of Scripture; "they are parts of its *records*." (B. L. p. 390.)

One point alone seems to result from this comparison between Dr. Hampden's past and present

statements; and this is, in its degree, consolatory to the Church; namely, that although Dr. Hampden has "admitted into the intellect a philosophical system, "in itself at variance with the Christian faith; it at "present lies there an uncongenial and foreign ele-"ment, its whole consequences neither perceived nor "entertained[c]." This was before anticipated; and it is satisfactory, for the present, to find it so: but man cannot stand still; and, after the recent example of one, who of late used the same language, and now is an avowed Socinian, it is fearful to think what may be the result. Even the above few extracts, (such as the time allowed to make,) sufficiently indicate how opposed the two systems are. The University has surely then a right to call upon Dr. Hampden to make his choice between them, openly to repudiate the speculations to which, on his own statement, the system of the Church is directly opposed, and so to begin to regain her confidence; not merely to "abandon a phraseology which is not generally un-"derstood." (p. 32.) Should he, by God's blessing, be enabled to come to this result, all the disquiet, and distraction, and sorrow, which this unhappy question has spread from one end of the Church to the other, would be beyond all comparison requited.

E. B. P.

Christ Church, March 21, 1836.

[c] See Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles compared. Pref. p. iv. vii.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

Erratum in part of the impression.

In p. 5, by some inadvertency, in Dr. Hampden's confession of faith in the Holy Trinity, he is quoted, as saying that "*our Lord* Jesus Christ "stands to us in a sublime and ineffable relation, as the only begotten Son "of God, who was with the Father and the Holy Spirit before all worlds, "and coequal with Them in majesty, *power, and eternity,*" (in p. 6, *glory* and *eternity.*) The statement is stronger, and approaches more to the confession of the Church than his own words; it should have stood, "Jesus, *as the Christ indeed*—coequal with Them in majesty, *and glory,* "*and holiness.*"

SPECIMENS

OF THE

THEOLOGICAL TEACHING

OF

CERTAIN MEMBERS

OF

THE CORPUS COMMITTEE

AT OXFORD.

"PROFESSING THEMSELVES TO BE WISE."

LONDON:
B. FELLOWES, LUDGATE STREET.
1836.

LONDON :

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD-STREET-HILL, DOCTORS' COMMONS.

SPECIMENS,

&c. &c.

THE extracts given in the following pages are so unlike what we are accustomed to read in the works of Protestant writers, and so like, on the other hand, what is found in those of Roman Catholics, that it may naturally be asked whether it is seriously meant by the compiler of them to impute Popish error to their authors. Such then is not his intention. It is probable their object in inditing such passages has been to resist Ultra-Protestant principles. Perhaps they have even persuaded themselves that they were most effectually resisting the encroachments of the Church of Rome by reviving a more loyal and respectful veneration for the Church and the sacraments, and primitive antiquity. But however laudable their profession and design,—is their

judgment to be trusted? Have they been duly cautious? Are they safe guides to a Protestant public? Is an author to be censured as *undervaluing* antiquity, or the sacraments, or the authority of the Church, by such writers as these? Does it follow that he must be heterodox, because he does not agree with them and their teaching? And yet these are the persons who are endeavouring to give the law of orthodoxy to the University! These are the persons, who, on the strength of their authority, invite the country clergy, by pamphlets and circulars, to a general rising in support of their peculiar views; who have been exerting every nerve to carry, by numbers and clamour, a vote of condemnation on the opinions of a writer who differs from them. These are the persons who would shut up all free discussion and inquiry in the *placets* of a majority affirming their decrees! Such a proceeding, indeed, may be very consistent conduct in such persons. No doubt, it may be "*painful*" to them: no doubt, they may apprehend "*danger*." But the question recurs—are these persons to be trusted? Are they judicious? Are they safe guides?

I.—On the Omissions of the Church of England.

"How miserably contrasted are we with the One Holy Apostolic Church of old, which, 'serving with one consent,' spoke 'a pure language!' And now that Rome has added, and we have omitted, in the catalogue of sacred doctrines,

what is left to us but to turn our eyes sorrowfully and reverently to those ancient times, and with Bishop Ken, make it our profession to live and 'die in the faith of the Catholic Church, before the division of the East and West?'" —*Tracts for the Times*, Vol. II.—*Records of the Church*, No. 25, p. 11. Note.

What, then, have we "omitted in the catalogue of sacred doctrines?" Will the following passage supply an answer?

"For example, would not most men maintain, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, was a superstition?—and yet both practices have the sanction of primitive usage." —*Tracts*, Vol. II. *Advertisement*, p. vi.

Or are prayers for the dead improperly omitted in our liturgies? or does our communion service stop short of the truth? For,

"All the ancient liturgies now existing, or which can be proved ever to have existed, ... contain a prayer (which has been excluded from the English Ritual) 'for the rest and peace of all those who have departed this life in God's faith and fear.'"

And again—

"On a comparison of the different forms of oblation and consecration, it will be seen that in each of the four original liturgies, the Eucharist is regarded as a mystery and as a sacrifice."

E.g. in "THE ROMAN FORM, translated from a missal now in use in the Church of Rome.—'We offer unto thy

glorious Majesty, of thine own gifts and presents, a pure Host, a holy Host, an immaculate Host,' &c."

"THE ORIENTAL FORM.—'We sinners offer unto thee, O Lord, this tremendous and unbloody sacrifice,' &c."

"THE EGYPTIAN FORM.—'Sanctify and thoroughly consecrate them: making the bread the body, and the cup the blood,' &c."

"THE GALLICAN FORM.—'Sanctify these Hosts, &c. . . . that they may confer eternal life and an everlasting kingdom on us who are going to eat and drink of them in the transformation of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thine only-begotten Son.'"

"Such is the view taken of the consecration and oblation of the eucharist, in the four independent Christian liturgies. It is well worth the consideration of such Protestant bodies as have rejected the ancient forms.

"Further information may be found respecting these remarkable documents in the valuable works, already quoted, of Dr. Brett and Mr. Palmer. It is, however, much to be wished, that correct editions of the original documents were in the hands of every one. It may perhaps be said, without exaggeration, that next to the Holy Scriptures they possess the greatest claim on our veneration and study."—*Tracts*, Vol. II. No. 63, pp. 7, 9—16.

But that some have already profited by the study of these remarkable documents may sufficiently appear by the following passage:—

"Then you will honour us [the 'inferior ministers,' as distinguished from the bishops, 'the representatives of Christ,'] with a purer honour than you do now; namely, as those who are entrusted with the keys of heaven and hell, as the heralds of mercy, as the denouncers of woe to wicked

men, as entrusted with the awful and mysterious gift of making the bread and wine Christ's body and blood."—*Tracts*, Vol. I. No. 10, p. 4.

II.—Contemplative Character of Christian Doctrine asserted.

What, again, shall we think of persons as judges of others, who regard some of the Christian doctrines as fitted rather for contemplative minds than for the vulgar?

"It has been fashionable then, for instance, to insist upon the practical character of Christianity, the influential nature of its doctrines, the persuasiveness of its motives, &c. This does not *necessarily* involve the disbelief of such parts as are not obviously practical; but it tends directly thereto. Such doctrines become a burthen unto man, so soon as he sets himself to form a system into which they refuse to be brought: he cannot any longer maintain them, without violence, on the same ground whereupon he defends the rest. Then he strains some truths, or rather degrades them, (as when the divinity of our Lord is insisted upon, only, as heightening the greatness of our redemption,) and so virtually obliterates whatever of that truth cannot be compressed within the compass of this so-called practical application: other truths, which belong to reverential contemplation rather, and are not fitted for every-day impulse upon a mixed multitude, are rudely laid aside, as abstract or unpractical."—*Pusey's Theol. Statements, &c.* pp. xv. xvi.

Or take another writer, who slides almost into the language of Epicurean theology:—

"And since this everlasting and unchangeable quiescence is the simplest and truest notion we can obtain of the Deity,

it seems to follow that, strictly speaking, all those so-called economies or dispensations, which display his character in action, are but condescensions to the infirmity and peculiarity of our minds, shadowy representations of realities which are incomprehensible to creatures such as ourselves, who estimate every thing by the rule of association and arrangement, by the notion of a purpose and plan, object and means, parts and whole."—*Newman's Arians*, p. 83.

Or take the following, which inculcates a reservation of Christian truths:—

"If the early Church regarded the very knowledge of the truth as a fearful privilege, much more did it regard that truth itself as glorious and awful; and scarcely conversing about it to her children, shrunk from the impiety of subjecting it to the hard gaze of the multitude. . . . . Then, they would scarcely express in writing, what is now not only preached to the mixed crowds who frequent our churches, but circulated in print among all ranks and classes of the unclean and the profane, and pressed upon all who choose to purchase it. . . . . This is the apology which the author of the present work, as far as it is worth while to notice himself, offers to all sober-minded and zealous Christians, for venturing to exhibit publicly the great evangelical doctrines, not indeed in the medium of controversy or proof, (which would be a still more humiliating office,) but in an historical and explanatory form. And he earnestly trusts, that, while doing so, he may be betrayed into no familiarity or extravagance of expression, cautiously lowering the truth, and (as it were) wrapping it in reverend language, and so depositing it in its due resting place, which is the Christian's heart; guiltless of those unutterable profanations with which a scrutinizing infidelity wounds and lacerates it."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 150—152.

III.—The Scriptures.

"No prophet ends his subject: his brethren after him renew, enlarge, transfigure, or reconstruct it; so that the Bible, though various in its parts, forms a whole, grounded on a few distinct doctrinal principles discernible throughout it; and is in consequence, though intelligible in its general drift, yet obscure in its text; and even tempts the student to a lax and disrespectful interpretation of it."—*Ibid.* pp. 64, 65.

"Moreover, Scripture assigns the same uses to this allegorical style, which were contemplated by the Fathers, when they made it subservient to the *disciplina arcani;* viz. those of trying the earnestness and patience of inquirers, discriminating between the proud and the humble, and conveying instruction to believers, and that in the most permanently impressive manner, without the world's catching its meaning. Our Lord's remarks on the design of his own parables is a sufficient evidence of this intention.

"Thus there seemed every encouragement, from the structure of the sacred volume, from the apparent causes which led to that structure, and from the purposes to which it was applied by its divine Author, to induce the Alexandrians to use its text as the instrument of an allegorical teaching."—*Newman's Arians,* pp. 65, 66.

"The whole Bible is, like the whole of nature, one great parable."—*Sewell's Thoughts on Subscription,* p. 24.

"Our animal frames are sufficiently multifarious in their uses. But compared with the Bible they are simplicity itself.

"To fulfil all these various purposes, the whole structure of the Bible is built upon contradictions."—*Ibid.* p. 26.

"Here, again, is strikingly instanced the unfitness of books, compared with private communication, for the pur-

poses of religious instruction; levelling the distinctions of mind and temper by the formality of the written character, and conveying each kind of knowledge the less perfectly, in proportion as it is of a moral nature, and requires to be treated with delicacy and discrimination." — *Newman's Arians*, p. 152.

Scripture accordingly would appear to be a less perfect vehicle of Truth than oral Tradition.

"And thus much on the importance of Creeds to tranquillize the mind; the text of Scripture being addressed principally to the affections, and though definite according to the criterion of practical influence, vague and incomplete in the judgment of the intellect.

"Nor, in the next place, is an assent to the text of Scripture sufficient for the purposes of Christian fellowship. As the sacred text was not intended to satisfy the intellect, neither was it given as a test of the religious temper which it forms, and of which it is an expression."—*Ibid.* pp. 161, 162.

IV.—Tradition.

"In corroboration of this remark, let it be observed, that there seems to have been in the Church a traditionary explanation of these historical types, derived from the Apostles, but kept among the secret doctrines, as being dangerous to the majority of hearers; and certainly St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, affords us an instance of such a tradition, both as existing and as secret, (even though it be shown to be of Jewish origin,) when first checking himself and questioning his brethren's faith, he communicates, not without hesitation, the evangelical scope of the account of Melchisedec, as introduced into the book of Genesis."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 68, 69.

"In what sense can it be said, that there is any connexion between Paganism and Christianity so real as to warrant the preacher of the latter to conciliate idolaters by allusion to it? St. Paul evidently connects the true religion with the existing systems which he laboured to supplant in Acts xvii. and his example is a sufficient guide to missionaries now, and a full justification of the line of conduct pursued by the Alexandrians, in the instances similar to it; but are we able to *account for* his conduct, and ascertain the principle by which it was regulated? I think we can; and the exhibition of it will set before the reader another doctrine of the Alexandrian school, which it is much to our purpose to understand, and which I shall call *the divinity of Traditionary Religion.*"—*Ibid.* pp. 87, 88.

"This vague and unconnected family of religious truths, originally from God, but sojourning without the sanction of miracle, or a definite home, as pilgrims up and down the world, and discernible and separable from the corrupt legends with which they are mixed, by the spiritual mind alone, may be called the *dispensation of Paganism*, after the example of the learned father already appealed to.*"—*Ibid.* p. 89.

"I have already observed, that the knowledge of the Christian mysteries was, in those times, accounted as a *privilege*, to be eagerly coveted. It was not likely, then, that reception of them would be accounted a *test*; which implies a concession on the part on the recipient, not an advantage. The idea of disbelieving, or criticising the great doctrines of the faith, from the nature of the case, would scarcely occur to the primitive Christians. These doctrines were the subject of an Apostolical Tradition; they

"* Clement says, *τὴν φιλοσοφ ίαν Ἑλλησιν οἷαδιαθήκη νοικείαν δεδόσθαι, ὑποβάθραν οὖσαν τῆς κατὰ Χριστὸν φιλοσοφίας.* Strom. vi. p. 648."—*Newman's Arians*, p. 89. Note.

were the very truths which had been lately revealed to mankind. They had been committed to the Church's keeping, and were dispensed by her to those who sought them, as a favour. They were facts, not opinions."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 147, 148.

"We have some difficulty in putting ourselves into the situation of Christians in those times, from the circumstance that the Holy Scriptures are now our sole means of satisfying ourselves on points of doctrine. Thus, every one who comes to the Church considers himself entitled to judge and decide individually upon its creed. But in the primitive age, the Apostolical Tradition, *i. e.* the creed, was practically the chief source of instruction, especially considering the obscurities of Scripture; and being withdrawn from public view, it could not be subjected to the degradation of a comparison, on the part of inquirers and half-christians, with those written documents which are vouchsafed to us from the same inspired authorities. As for the baptized and incorporate members of the Church, they of course had the privilege of comparing the written and the oral tradition, and might exercise it as profitably as that of comparing and harmonising Scripture with itself. But before baptism, the systematic knowledge was withheld; and without it, Scripture, instead of being the source of instruction on the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, was scarcely more than a sealed book, needing an interpretation, amply and powerfully as it served the purpose of *proving* the doctrines, when they were once disclosed."—*Ibid.* pp. 148, 149.

"At the creation of the Church an authority of inspiration was raised up, to be orally consulted, and to be obeyed in the testimony of miracles. This was withdrawn by degrees; and human authority, human so far as it is tried by the same tests which are applied to it in other knowledge, yet divine in its apostolical tradition, was substituted as a guide to the Bible. From this flow our grammars of religion,

our catechisms. From this also are derived our standard correctives of error—our Articles."—*Sewell's Thoughts on Subscription*, p. 24.

V.—On the Nature and Use of Creeds and Articles.

"If I avow my belief, that freedom from symbols and articles is abstractedly the highest state of Christian communion, and the peculiar privilege of the primitive Church, it is not from any tenderness towards that proud impatience of control in which many exult, as in a virtue: but, first, because technicality and formalism are, in their degree, inevitable results of public confessions of faith; and next, because when confessions do not exist, the mysteries of divine truth, instead of being exposed to the gaze of the profane and uninstructed, are kept hidden in the bosom of the Church far more faithfully than is otherwise possible, and reserved by a private teaching, through the channel of her ministers, as rewards in due measure and season for those who are prepared to profit by them; those, *i. e.* who are diligently passing through the successive stages of faith and obedience; and thus, while the Church is not committed to declarations, which, most true as they are, still are daily wrested by infidels to their ruin; so, on the other hand, much of that mischievous fanaticism is avoided which at present abounds from the vanity of men, who think that they can explain the sublime doctrines and exuberant promises of the gospel, before they have yet learned to know themselves, and to discern the holiness of God, under the preparatory discipline of the law and of natural religion."—*Newman's Arians*, p. 41, 42.

Let us hear another writer on this point:—

"There are some things in our creeds and articles too much associated in our minds with scholastic follies and extinct errors: some things which seem obsolete, and

certainly some imperativeness of tone, which may offend the pride of our reason, and even seem at times to detract from our reverence for the Bible."—*Sewell's Thoughts on Subscription*, p. 21.

And yet this same writer soon after asserts the inspiration of the Articles; and goes so far as to ascribe also a like value to all creeds, confessions, formularies of doctrine, and summaries of Christian education, from all bodies of Christians.

"We may add, from the assurance of God, that his own Inspiration was not wanting. But these are not perhaps days when the direct abiding presence of God's Holy Spirit upon earth in the heart of his Church can be spoken of, without risking irreverence, or when common men know enough of the past to understand how the lives and deaths of the great framers of our Articles attested a supernatural assistance. But indeed not our own Articles only, though they claim authority in a more high and especial sense; but all creeds, confessions, formularies of doctrine, and summaries of Christian education, which come from bodies of Christians, are valuable in the same manner. They ought all to be maintained."—*Ibid.* p. 33.

He proceeds, accordingly, to place the Articles of the Church on the same footing as the Bible.

"But the authority of the Church is embodied in its Articles of faith, and therefore those Articles can no more be dispensed with; they are to be watched over with scarcely less care; they are as much an integral part of the Christian dispensation as the Bible itself."—*Ibid.* p. 34.

"She [the University] lays formally in their hands the two great foundations of their religion, the Bible and the Articles: for the Bible is included in the Articles."—*Ibid.* p. 37.

VI.—Doctrine of the Trinity.

"It is unquestionable that, from very early times, traditions have been afloat through the world, attaching the notion of a Trinity, in some sense or other, to the First Cause."—*Newman's Arians*, p. 100.

"But very different was the influence of the ancient theory of Plato, however originated, when it came in contact with believers in the inspired records; who at once discerned in it that mysterious doctrine, brought out as if into bodily shape and almost practical persuasiveness, which lay hid under the angelic manifestations of the Law and the visions of the Prophets."—*Ibid.* p. 102.

"Even after this Alexandrino-Judaic doctrine had been corrected and completed by the inspired Apostles, St. Paul and St. John, it did not lose its hold upon the Fathers of the Christian Church, who could not but discern in the old Scriptures, even more clearly than their predecessors, those rudiments of the perfect truth which God's former revelations concealed."—*Ibid.* pp. 103, 104.

"Let it be observed then, that, as regards the doctrine of the Trinity, the mere text of Scripture is not calculated either to *satisfy the intellect* or to *ascertain the temper* of those who profess to accept it as a rule of faith."—*Ibid.* p. 158.

"Thus the systematic doctrine of the Trinity may be considered as the shadow, projected for the contemplation of the intellect, of the Object of scripturally-informed piety; a representation, economical; necessarily imperfect, as being exhibited in a foreign medium, and therefore involving apparent inconsistencies or mysteries; given to the Church by tradition contemporaneously with those apostolic writings, which are addressed more directly to the heart; kept in the background in the infancy of Christianity, when faith and

obedience were vigorous, and brought forward at a time when, reason being disproportionally developed, and aiming at sovereignty in the province of religion, its presence became necessary to expel an usurping idol from the house of God."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 159, 160.

VII.—Application of the Word Facts to Religious Truths.

Let it be borne in mind that these writers, in their late controversial papers and tracts, have loudly cried out against the application of this term to the truths of Scripture.

"History is made the external garb of prophecy, and persons and facts become the figures of heavenly things. I need only refer, by way of instance, to the delineation of Abraham as the type of the accepted worshipper of God; the history of the brazen serpent; the prophetical bearing of the 'call of Israel out of Egypt;' the personification of the Church in the Apostolic Epistles as the reflected image of Christ; and, further, to the mystical import, interpreted by our Lord himself, of the title of God as the God of the Patriarchs. Above all other subjects, it need scarcely be said, the likeness of the promised Mediator is conspicuous throughout the sacred volume as in a picture; moving along the line of the history, in one or other of his destined offices, the dispenser of blessings in Joseph, the inspired interpreter of truth in Moses, the conqueror in Joshua, the active preacher in Samuel, the suffering combatant in David, and in Solomon the triumphant and glorious king."—*Newman's Arians*, p. 65.

"These doctrines [the Christian mysteries] were the subject of an Apostolical Tradition; they were the very truths

which had been lately revealed to mankind. They had been committed to the Church's keeping, and were dispensed by her to those who sought them, as a favour. They were facts, not opinions."—*Newman's Arians*, p. 148.

"These observations, thus far, have been directed to those men, and they are very numerous in the present day, who cannot understand the utility of any thing like a creed of facts as distinct from moral lessons."—*Sewell's Thoughts on Subscription*, p. 17.

"So much for the importance of sound opinions and facts, as distinct from moral precepts."—*Ibid.* p. 20.

"Thus the facts of a Trinity in unity, the perfect humanity and perfect divinity of our Lord, predestination and free will, faith and works, the fear of God and the love of God, man's greatness and his meanness, the permission of evil, and yet the prevalence of good, the omnipotence of grace, and yet the necessity of self-exertion, the absence of merit, and yet the distribution of rewards, the right of private judgment, and the submission to authority;—these and very many more might be mentioned, as instances of *opposite poles, between which the human heart is constantly vibrating, till it settles down into a fixed centre of moderation and adjustment.*"—*Ibid.* p. 26.

VIII.—Treatment of Dissenters, Heretics, or Sinners.

"No economy can be employed towards those who have been once enlightened, and have fallen away. I wish to speak explicitly on this subject, because there is a great deal of that spurious charity among us, which would cultivate the friendship of those who, in a Christian country, speak against the Church or its creeds. Origen and others were not unwilling to be on a footing of intercourse with the heathen philosophers of their day, in order, if it were possible, to lead them into the truth; but deliberate heretics and apostates, those who had known the truth, and rejected it, were

objects of their abhorrence, and were avoided from the truest charity to them. For what can be said to those who already know all we have to say? and how can we show our fear for their souls, nay, and for our own stedfastness, except by a strong action? Thus Origen, when a youth, could not be induced to attend the prayers of an heretic of Antioch whom his patroness had adopted, βδελυττόμενος, from a loathing, as he says, of heresy. And St. Austin himself tells us, that while he was a Manichee, his own mother would not eat at the same table with him in her house, from her strong aversion to the blasphemies which were the characteristic of his sect. And Scripture fully sanctions this mode of acting by the severity with which such unhappy men are spoken of, on the different occasions when mention is made of them."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 94, 95.

"Now it has sometimes been said that the commands of strenuous and stern service given to the Israelites,—for instance, relative to their taking and keeping possession of the promised land,—do not apply to us Christians. There can be no doubt it is not our duty to take the sword and kill the enemies of God, as the Jews were told to do; 'Put up again thy sword into his place,' are our Saviour's words to St. Peter. So far, then, if this is what is meant by saying that these commands do not apply to us, so far, doubtless, it is clear they do not apply to us. But it does not hence follow that the temper of mind which they pre-suppose and foster is not required of us; else, surely, the Jewish history is no longer profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness. St. Peter was blamed, not for his zeal, but for his use of the sword."—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. iii. p. 191.

"Next observe, this merciless temper, as profane people would call it, but as well-instructed Christians say, this godly zeal, was enjoined upon them under far more distressing circumstances, viz. the transgressions of their own rela-

tions and friends. . . . . Now, doubtless, we at this day are not to put men to death for idolatry; but, doubtless also, whatever temper of mind the fulfilment of this command implied in the Jew, such, essentially, must be our temper of mind, whatever else it may be also. . . . . Nor was the severe temper under review a duty in the early ages of Judaism only. . . . These are some, out of many instances, which might be brought from the Jewish history, in proof of the duty of strict and severe loyalty to God and his revealed will; and I here adduce them, first, to show that the commands involving it could not, (their number and variety are so great,) could not have related to a merely outward and ceremonial obedience, but must have wrought in the Jews a certain temper of mind, pleasing to God, and therefore necessary for us also to possess."*—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. iii. pp. 193—197.

"Thus a certain fire of zeal, showing itself, not by force and blood, but as really and certainly as if it did, cutting through natural feelings, neglecting self, preferring God's glory to all things, firmly resisting sin, protesting against

* Compare with this the following passage of Bishop Butler:—"Indeed there are some particular precepts in Scripture, given to particular persons, requiring actions which would be immoral and vicious, were it not for such precepts. But it is easy to see that all these are of such a kind as that the precept changes the whole nature of the case and of the action; and both constitutes and shows that not to be unjust or immoral, which, prior to the precept, must have appeared and really have been so; which may well be, since none of these precepts are contrary to immutable morality. If it were commanded to cultivate the principles, and act from the spirit of treachery, ingratitude, cruelty, the command would not alter the nature of the case, or of the action, in any of these instances," &c.—*Anal.* pt. ii. ch. 3. See also *Graves' Lectures on the Pentateuch*, pt. iii. Lect. 1. Mr. Newman would not have the particular act imitated, but he would have the Christian adopt the spirit of the act, and convert it into a general principle.

sinners, and steadily contemplating their punishment, is a duty in all creatures of God, a duty in the case of Christians in the midst of all that excellent overflowing charity which is the highest gospel grace, and the fulfilling of the second table of the law."—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. iii. pp. 199, 200.

"We hate sinners, by putting them out of our sight as if they were not, by annihilating them in our affections. And this we must do, even in the case of our friends and relations, if God requires it. But in no case are we to allow ourselves in resentment or malice."—*Ibid.* p. 201.

"Next, it is quite compatible with the most earnest zeal, to offer kind offices to God's enemies when in distress. I do not say that a denial of these offices may not be a duty ordinarily; for it is our duty, as St. John tells us in his second Epistle, not even to receive them into our houses."—*Ibid.* pp. 201, 202.

"The Psalmist speaks in this spirit, when, after praying to God 'to persecute' the ungodly 'with his tempest,' he adds, 'fill their faces with shame, that they may seek thy name, O Lord.'"—*Ibid.* p. 202.

"Doubtless, while these servants of God [the people who fought against Sihon, and those who took Jericho, and Samuel who sent Saul to slay in Amalek, and David 'who had a fiery zeal, so as even to consume him,'] executed his judgments, they still could bend in pity and in hope over the young and old whom they slew with the sword,—severely merciful;—an unspeakable trial, doubtless, of faith and self-mastery, and requiring a very exalted and refined spirit successfully to undergo."—*Ibid.* p. 203.

"Shall we be perversely persuaded by the appearance of amiableness or kindness in those whom God's word bids us depart from as heretics, or profligate livers, or troublers of the Church? . . . . . O that there was in us this high temper of mingled austerity and love! Barely do we conceive of severity by itself, and of kindness by itself; but

who unites them? We think we cannot be kind without ceasing to be severe. . . . What a state we are in, when any one who speaks the plain threats of our Lord and his Apostles against sinners, or ventures to defend the anathemas of his Church, is thought unfeeling rather than merciful; when they who separate from the irreligious world are blamed as fanciful and extravagant, and those who confess the truth, as it is in Jesus, are said to be bitter, hot of head, and intemperate! Yet, with God's grace, with the history of the Old Testament before us, and the fearful recompense to warn us which came upon backsliding Israel, we, the Ministers of Christ, dare not keep silence amid this great error."—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. iii. pp. 204, 205.

How extensively the term "sinners" is meant to extend, may be seen from the following. It must be recollected that these sentiments flow from "the mild Author of the Elucidations," as he is termed in one of Professor Pusey's pamphlets:—the "mild" author!

"There is not a dissenter living, but, inasmuch and so far as he dissents, is in a sin," &c.—*Ibid.* p. 220.

IX.—Commenting on Scripture, and Method of Religious Teaching.

"So far as men use the language of the Bible, (as is often done in poems and works of fiction,) as the mere instrument of a cultivated fancy, to make their style attractive or impressive, so far, it is needless to say, they are guilty of a great irreverence towards its Divine Author. On the other hand, it is surely no extravagance to assert that there are minds so gifted and disciplined as to approach the position occupied by the inspired writers, and therefore able to apply their words with a fitness, and are entitled to do so with a freedom, which is unintelligible to the dull or heart-

less criticism of inferior understandings. So far then as the Alexandrian Fathers partook of such a singular gift of grace, (and Origen surely bears on him the tokens of some exalted moral dignity,) not incited by a capricious and presumptuous imagination, but burning with that vigorous faith, which, seeing God in all things, does and suffers all for his sake, and, while filled with the contemplation of his supreme glory, still discharges each command in the exactness of its real meaning, in the same degree they stand not merely excused, but are placed immeasurably above the multitude of those who find it so easy to censure them. And so much on the Allegory, as the means of observing the *disciplina arcani*."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 70, 71.

" So far must be granted in fairness," [that rules of right and wrong must be applied in estimating the conduct of even the best of mere men]; " but some have gone on to censure the *principle* itself which this procedure involved, viz. that of representing religion, for the purpose of conciliating the heathen, in the form most attractive to their prejudices."—*Ibid.* p. 72.

" The mode of arguing and teaching in question, which is called *economical* (κατ' οἰκονομίαν) by the ancients, can scarcely be disconnected from the *disciplina arcani*, as will appear by some of the instances which follow, though it is convenient to consider it by itself. If it is necessary to contrast the two with each other, the one may be considered as withholding the truth, and the other as setting it out to advantage. The economy is certainly sanctioned by St. Paul in his own conduct. To the Jews he became as a Jew, and as without the Law to the heathen."—*Ibid.* p. 72.

" The last-mentioned Father (Justin) will afford us an instance of an economical relinquishment of a sacred doctrine."—*Ibid.* p. 75.

" Athanasius himself fully recognises the propriety of this concealment of the doctrine [of Christ's divinity] on a fitting occasion; and thus accounts for the silence of the

Apostles concerning it in their speeches recorded in the Book of Acts, viz. that they were unwilling, by a disclosure of it, to prejudice the Jews against those miracles, the acknowledgment of which was a first step towards their receiving it."—*Newman's Arians*, p. 76.

"'Even Athanasius,' he [Petavius] says, ... 'even this keen and vigilant champion of orthodoxy, in arguing with the Gentiles for the divinity and incarnation of the Word, urges them with considerations drawn from their own philosophical notions concerning him. Not that he was ignorant how unlike orthodoxy, and how like Arianism, such notions were, but he bore in mind the necessity of favourably disposing the minds of the Gentiles to listen to his teaching; and he was aware that it was one thing to lay the rudiments of the faith in an ignorant or heathen mind, and another to defend the faith against heretics, or to teach it dogmatically.'"—*Ibid.* p. 78.

"If he is to teach them [strangers to the tone of thought and principles of the speaker] at all, he must put before them large propositions, which he has afterwards to modify, or make assertions which are but parallel or analogous to the truth, rather than coincident with it. And it cannot be denied, that those who attempt to speak at all times the naked truth, or rather (as it may be called) the commonly-received expression of it, are certain, more than other men, to convey wrong impressions of their meaning to those who happen to be below them, or to differ widely from them, in intelligence and cast of mind."—*Ibid.* p. 79.

"Merely to leave a man in errors which he had independently of us, or to refuse to remove them, cannot be objected to as a fault, and may be a duty; though it is so difficult to hit the mark in these perplexing cases, that it is not wonderful should these or other fathers have failed at times, and said more or less than was proper. Again, in the instances of St. Paul, Theonas, Origen, and Clement, the doctrine which their conduct implies, is the divinity of

Paganism; a true doctrine, though the heathen whom they addressed, at first would not rightly apprehend it."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 80, 81.

"He [the Christian] thinks and speaks the truth; except when consideration is necessary, and then, as a physician for the good of his patients, he will be false, or utter a falsehood, as the Sophists say."—*Ibid.* (*Citation from Clem. Alex.*) p. 81.

"Further light will be thrown upon the doctrine of the Economy, by considering it as exemplified in the dealings of Providence towards man. . . . . And since this everlasting and unchangeable quiescence is the simplest and truest notion we can obtain of the Deity, it seems to follow that, strictly speaking, all those so-called Economies or dispensations, which display his character in action, are but condescensions to the infirmity and peculiarity of our minds, shadowy representations of realities which are incomprehensible to creatures such as ourselves, who estimate every thing by the rule of association and arrangement, by the notion of a purpose and plan, object and means, parts and whole. What, *e.g.* is the revelation of general moral laws, their infringement, their tedious victory, the endurance of the wicked, and the 'winking at the times of ignorance,' but an οἰκονομία of greater truths untold, the best practical communication of them which our minds in their present state will admit? What are the phenomena of the external world, but a divine mode of conveying to the mind the realities of existence, individuality, and the influence of being on being, the best possible, though beguiling the imaginations of most men with a harmless but unfounded belief in matter as distinct from the impressions on their senses. . . . . And though, on the mind's first mastering this general principle, it seems to itself at the moment to have cut all the ties which bind it to the universe, and to be floated off upon the ocean of interminable scepticism; yet a true sense of its own weakness brings it back,

the instinctive persuasion that it must be intended to rely on something, and therefore that the information given, though philosophically inaccurate, must be practically certain. . . . Again, the Mosaic dispensation was an οἰκονομία, simulating (so to say) unchangeableness, when from the first it was destined to be abolished. And our blessed Lord's conduct on earth abounds with the like gracious and considerate condescension to the weakness of his creatures, who would have been driven either to a terrified inaction, or to presumption, had they known then as afterwards the secret of his divine nature."—*Newman's Arians*, pp. 82—85.

"If this doctrine be scriptural, it is not difficult to determine the line of conduct which is to be observed by the Christian apologist and missionary. Believing God's hand to be in every system, so far forth as it is true, (though Scripture alone is the depositary of his unadulterated and complete revelation) he will, after St. Paul's manner, seek some points in the existing superstitions as the basis of his own instructions, instead of indiscriminately condemning and discarding the whole assemblage of heathen opinions and practices. . . . . And while he strenuously opposes all that is idolatrous, immoral, and profane, in their creed, he will profess to be leading them on to perfection, and recovering and purifying, rather than reversing the essential principles of their belief."—*Ibid.* pp. 92, 93.

"What I have said about the method of teaching adopted by the Alexandrian, and more or less by the other primitive Churches, amounts to this—that they on principle refrained from telling unbelievers all they believed themselves, and further, that they endeavoured to connect their own creed with theirs, whether Jewish or pagan, adopting their sentiments, and even language, as far as they lawfully could. Some instances of this have been given; more will follow in the remarks, which I shall now make, upon the influence of Platonism on their theological language."—*Ibid.* p. 99.

"To return to the primitive fathers.—With their reve-

rential feelings towards the Supreme Being, great must have been their indignation first, and then their perplexity, when apostates disclosed and corrupted the sacred truth, or when the heretical or philosophical sects made guesses approximating to it."—*Newman's Arians*, p. 152.

X.—Baptism.

To understand Professor Pusey's doctrine of Baptism, it is necessary to read through about 300 closely printed pages of a series of Tracts contained in the "Collection of Tracts for the Times." In that work indeed he has developed his peculiar scheme of Theology, which he confidently asserts to be the primitive one, and condemns whatever differs from his views under the name of the "modern theology." Let any, however, commence the reading of this elaborate performance, and he will soon wonder into what strange land he has passed from the ground on which our great Reformers stood. The Church and its ordinances become all in all, whilst the teaching of the Spirit by the word of God, the doctrines of free grace, of justification by faith, of remission of sins through the blood of Christ in conjunction with repentance, appear only secondary and supplementary parts of the scheme of religion. Professor Pusey himself is fearful of the perplexity which he may have produced by his discussion of the subject.

"On one point," he says, "I fear that the doctrines of the ancient Church are so distinct from modern ultra-

Protestant theology on the one hand, as also from the Romanist on the other, that the view which I have exhibited of the character of sin after Baptism may cause perplexity." —*Preface to Tract on Baptism*, p. 12.

The following passage may be selected out of the mass as a specimen of his views, and application of Scripture :—

"Two great branches of our blessed Saviour's office are set forth to us, his death and his intercession—his death, the merits of which are applied to us in Baptism, as containing the remission of all *past* sin, the death of the old man, the imparting of a new nature, the quickening and renewing our souls, the placing us in a state of salvation, as saith St. Paul—'God hath set forth Christ Jesus to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of the sins that are past,' the former sins (*τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων*) (Rom. iii. 25,) 'the sins of the times of ignorance:' (Acts xvii. 30.) His intercession for sins into which through the infirmity of the flesh, though Christians, we may yet fall. 'For these,' St. John, who is manifestly speaking of the sins of true believers, saith, 'we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins:' but we have no account in Scripture of any second remission, obliteration, extinction of all sin, such as is bestowed upon us by 'the one Baptism for the remission of sins.' And that such was the view of the ancient Church, appears the more from the very abuse which we find derived from it; that many, namely, delayed continually the Sacrament of Baptism (much as persons now do the other Sacrament), because, after they should have received it, they should no more have such full remission."—*Tract on Baptism*, pp. 54, 55.

XI.—Justification.

Let the simple Church-of-England man ask himself where he has ever read in the Articles of his Church, or the works of its orthodox divines, such passages as these :—

" Hence we have almost embraced the doctrine, that God conveys grace only through the instrumentality of the mental energies, that is, through faith, prayer, active spiritual contemplations, or (what is called) communion with God, in contradiction to the primitive view, according to which the Church and her Sacraments are the ordained and direct visible means of conveying to the soul what is in itself supernatural and unseen. For example, would not most men maintain, on the first view of the subject, that to administer the Lord's Supper to infants, or to the dying and insensible, however consistently pious and believing in their past lives, was a superstition? and yet both practices have the sanction of primitive usage. And does this not account for the prevailing indisposition to admit that Baptism conveys regeneration? Indeed, this may even be set down as the essence of Sectarian Doctrine (however its mischief may be restrained or compensated, in the case of individuals), to consider faith, and not the Sacraments, as the instrument of justification and other gospel gifts; instead of holding, that the grace of Christ comes to us altogether from without (as from him, so through externals of his ordaining), faith being but the *sine quâ non*, the necessary condition on our parts for duly receiving it."—*Tracts for the Times*, vol. ii. p. vi.

" A man may object indeed, that in the Epistle to the Romans nothing is said about channels and instruments; that faith is represented as the sole medium of justification. But I will refer him, by way of reply, to the same Apostle's

speech to Festus and Agrippa, where he describes Christ as saying to him on his miraculous conversion, 'Rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a Minister and a Witness,' sending him forth (as it would appear), to preach the Gospel, without instrumentality of Ordinance or Minister. Had we but this account of his conversion, who would not have supposed, that he who was 'to open men's eyes, and turn them from darkness to light,' had been pardoned and accepted at once upon his faith, without rite or form? Yet from other parts of the history, we learn what is here omitted, viz. that an especial revelation was made to Ananias, lest Saul should lack baptism; and that, so far from his being justified immediately on his faith, he was bid not to tarry, but 'to arise and be baptized, and *to wash away his sins*, calling on the name of the Lord.'"— *Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. ii. pp. 342, 343.

XII.—Intercession of Saints.

"We are not solitary, though we seem so. Few now alive may understand or sanction us; but those multitudes in the primitive time, who believed, and taught, and worshipped, as we do, still live unto God, and, in their past deeds and their present voices, cry from the altar. They animate us by their example; they cheer us by their company; they are on our right hand and our left, Martyrs, Confessors, and the like, high and low, who used the same creeds, and celebrated the same ordinances, and preached the same Gospel as we do."—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. iii. p. 419.

"He [Christ] died to bestow upon him [man] that privilege which implies or involves all others, and brings him into nearest resemblance to himself, the privilege of intercession. This, I say, is the Christian's especial prerogative; and if

he does not exercise it, certainly he has not risen to the conception of his real place among created beings. Say not he is a Son of Adam, and has to undergo a future judgment; I know it: but he is something besides. How far he is advanced into that higher state of being, how far he still languishes in his first condition, is, in the case of individuals, a secret with God. Still every Christian is, in a certain sense, both in the one and the other: viewed in himself he ever prays for pardon, and confesses sin; but viewed in Christ, 'he has access into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoices in hope of the glory of God.' Viewed in his place in 'the Church of the First-born enrolled in heaven,' with his original debt cancelled in Baptism, and all subsequent penalties respited by Absolution, standing in God's presence upright and irreprovable, accepted in the Beloved, clad in the garments of righteousness, anointed with oil, and with a crown upon his head, in royal and priestly garb, as an heir of eternity, full of grace and good works, as walking in all the commandments of the Lord blameless,—such an one, I repeat it, is plainly in his fitting place, when he intercedes. He is made after the pattern and in the fulness of Christ,—he is what Christ is. Christ intercedes above, and he intercedes below. Why should he linger in the doorway, praying for pardon, who has been allowed to share in the grace of the Lord's passion, to die with him and rise again? He is already in a capacity for higher things. His prayer thenceforth takes a higher range, and contemplates not himself merely, but others also. He is taken into the confidence and counsels of his Lord and Saviour."—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. iii. pp. 394, 395. See also vol. i. pp. 307.

It cannot, perhaps, be said that this is openly preaching works of supererogation. But does it not lead to it? Does it not intimate more than that the prayer of the righteous man avails for

another, namely, that his "capacity for greater things," his greater goodness, redounds to another's benefit?

XIII.—The Virgin Mary.

"But further, she is doubtless to be accounted blessed and favoured in herself, as well as in the benefits she has done us. Who can estimate the holiness and perfection of her, who was chosen to be the Mother of Christ? If to him that hath, more is given, and holiness and divine favour go together (and this we are expressly told), what must have been the angelic purity of her, whom the Creator Spirit condescended to overshadow with his miraculous presence? What must have been her gifts, who was chosen to be the only near earthly relative of the Son of God, the only one whom he was bound by nature to revere and look up to; the one appointed to train and educate him, to instruct him day by day, as he grew in wisdom and in stature? This contemplation runs to a higher subject, did we dare follow it; for what, think you, was the sanctity and grace of that human nature, of which God formed his sinless Son; knowing, as we do, 'that what is born of the flesh, is flesh;' and that 'none can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?'.... As St. Paul himself said, that he 'knew no man after the flesh,' so his Saviour, with somewhat a similar meaning, has hid from us the knowledge of his more sacred and familiar feelings, his feelings towards his Mother and his friend. These were not to be exposed, as unfit for the world to know,—as dangerous, because not admitting of being known, without a risk lest the honour which those Saints received through grace, should eclipse in our minds the honour of Him who honoured them. Had the Virgin Mary been more fully disclosed to us in the celestial beauty and fragrancy of the spirit within her, true, *she* would have been honoured, *her* gifts would have been

clearly seen; but, at the same time, the Giver would have been somewhat less contemplated, because no design or work of his would have been disclosed in her history..... But, further, the more we consider who the Virgin was, the more dangerous will such knowledge of her appear to be. Other Saints are but influenced or inspired by Christ, and made partakers of him spiritually. But, as to the Virgin, Christ derived his soul and body from her, and so had an especial unity of nature with her; and this wondrous relationship between God and man, it is perhaps impossible for us to dwell much upon without some perversion of feeling. For, truly, she is raised above the condition of sinful beings, though she was a sinner; she is brought near to God, yet is but a creature; and, seems to lack her fitting place in our limited understandings, neither too high nor too low. We cannot combine in our thought of her, all we should ascribe with all we should withhold. Hence, following the example of Scripture, we had better only think of her with and for her Son, never separating her from him, but, using her name as a memorial of his great condescension in stooping from heaven, and 'not abhorring the Virgin's womb.'.... And when sorrow came upon her afterwards, it was but the blessed participation of her Son's sacred sorrows, not the sorrow of those who suffer for their sins."—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. ii. pp. 145—151.

XIV.—Marriage.

"Accordingly, from that time, Marriage has not only been restored to its original dignity, but even gifted with a portion of spiritual grace, as the outward symbol of the heavenly union subsisting between Christ and his Church." —*Ibid.* p. 145.

What hinders him then from including Marriage in the number of Sacraments?

XV.—Celibacy.

"St. John, after our Lord's example, implies especial praise upon those who follow an unmarried life,—involving the letter in the spirit, as is frequent in Scripture. 'These are they which were not defiled with women, for they are virgins; these are they which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.' St. Paul gives more direct praise to the same state, and gives the same reason for its especial blessedness; 'He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. . . . . I speak this for your own profit . . . . . that ye may attend upon the Lord without distraction.'"—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. ii. pp. *222, 223.*

In a note occurs the following passage:—

"Childhood, Virginity, Martyrdom, are made in Scripture at once the types and standards of religious perfection."—*Ibid. 223.*

XVI.—Extreme Unction.

Mr. Newman does not expressly recommend this rite, but his language favours the notion of its "intercessory" value.

"And this agrees with St. James's direction, which seems to invest the elders of the Church with this same privilege of the Priesthood. 'Is any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the Church, *and let them pray over him* (not pray *with* him merely), anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and *the prayer of faith* (not the oil merely), shall save the sick, and the Lord shall raise him up.'"—*Ibid.* p. 346.

XVII.—The Church and St. Peter.

"In referring to Scripture for the proof of points relating to the doctrine of the Church, we sometimes find the force of our arguments evaded by the objection that, although the texts and passages we refer to seem to prove the points for which they are cited, we still appear to be giving them an undue prominence in our system . . . . . Now, to meet this difficulty, let it be considered that the restoration of a doctrine so evidently important in its bearings as that of the Church, must necessarily produce a great change upon a system out of which it has been lost. We have been accustomed to a Ptolemaic theory of our spiritual system; we have made our own little world the centre, and have ranged the doctrines of Scripture around it, according to the relation they seem severally to bear to our own individual profit. We find ourselves called upon to adopt an opposite theory; to take for the centre of our system a body which we had been used to regard as a mere satellite attending upon our own orb. No wonder if we feel our notions deranged; if every thing seems put into a new place; that which before was primary, now made subordinate; and *vice versâ*."—*Tracts*, No. 49, pp. 1, 2.

Are we then to restore matters to the condition in which they stood before the Reformation; the Church to be the centre, and the Scriptures to be the inferior luminaries attending on the orb of the Church? But let us hear what the writer has to say about St. Peter—

"The promise is made to St. Peter; it may be well, therefore, to look through the Gospel, and collect the scattered notices of this Apostle. We shall thus ascertain whether the promise would seem to have been made to St. Peter

individually, as the Romanist would argue [where do the Romanists say that the promise was made to St. Peter 'individually?'] or whether, as Churchmen in England would say, it was made to him as the representative of the Apostolic body, and so the type of the Christian ministry. Or, on the other hand, we shall see whether the mention of St. Peter in this passage, and the prominent place which seems in it to be given him, stand so completely alone that it cannot be wrought into any thing like a regular system. Now, if we look carefully into St. Matthew's Gospel, we seem to find, throughout, a peculiar place occupied by St. Peter..... Throughout St. Matthew's Gospel, St. Peter seems to be put forward in a very peculiar manner, of which, however, we are scarcely aware, until we compare the other Evangelists, and observe the difference between them in their selection and arrangement of the events they record. This is, however, too extensive a subject to enter upon at present. Our only object is to suggest the inquiry, whether there is not something more than casual in the prominent place which St. Peter occupies in St. Matthew's Gospel, and whether this peculiarity does not imply the existence of some deeper meaning than we should at first sight attach to several apparently insulated passages, in the centre of which stands the noble confession in the sixteenth chapter, and the gracious and glorious promise which was founded upon it."—*Tracts*, No. 49, pp. 3—5.

XVIII.—Union of Church and State.

The Italics in the following passages are not in the text of the authors.

"The Latin ecclesiastical system of the middle ages may be considered the shadow, dark indeed and shapeless, still the shadow of that gracious design, which would have been accomplished, had Christians possessed faith enough to keep closely to God's revealed will. For what we know, it was

intended that all the kingdoms of the earth should have been made subject to the spiritual rule of the Church. The presumption of man defeated this purpose; but it could not so far defeat it, but some sort of fulfilment took place—[fulfilment in 'the case of the Papacy.']"—*Newman's Paroch. Serm.* vol. ii. pp. 279, 280.

"As for ourselves, what was the exact measure of the offences of our forefathers in the faith, when they tired of the Christian Theocracy, and clothed the Church with 'the purple robe' of Cæsar, it avails not to determine. Not denying their sin, still, after contemplating the glories of the Temple which they built, we may well bewail *our present fallen state.*"—*Ibid.* p. 280.

"Then, as now, there was the prospect, and partly the presence in the Church, of an Heretical Power enthralling it, exerting a varied influence and an *usurped claim in the appointment of her functionaries,* and interfering with the management of her internal affairs. . . . . Meanwhile we may take comfort in reflecting, that though the *present tyranny has more of insult* than has hitherto attended the ascendency of Arianism, we may rejoice in the piety, prudence, and varied graces of our Spiritual Rulers; and may rest in the confidence, that, should the hand of Satan press us sore, our Athanasius and Basil will be given us in their destined season, 'to break the bonds of the oppressor, and let the captives go free.'"—*Newman's Arians,* p. 422.

These extracts might have been greatly extended, and a fuller evidence thus obtained of the mode of treating theological subjects, which these writers employ. But there is enough to show at least a tendency in their views towards those of the Church of Rome. Doubtless they

have their qualifications and restrictions, by which the imputation of Popery may be repelled. Mr. Newman, for instance, would limit that designation to the state of the Roman Catholic Church after the Council of Trent, (see his *Arians*, p. 421,) and probably would not object to that kind of Popery which existed before the Council. Nor does he object to his system and doctrines being thought like Popery, since if "primitive," they ought, he thinks, to bear some likeness to Popery.—(*See Advertisement to 3d Vol. of Parochial Sermons.*) Professor Pusey again warns us to "distinguish between the practical corruptions of the Church of Rome, and her theoretical errors. For it often happens," he adds, "that she leads her members into error, and countenances corruption in them, where her statements in themselves are not very unsound."—(*Tracts for the Times*, Vol. II. p. 192.) Indeed, while these writers profess their love and reverence of the Church of Rome, they take care to *protest* against it, as all Protestants of course must do. Thus says a writer in the Tracts:—"Considering the high gifts, and the strong claims of the Church of Rome and its dependencies on our admiration, reverence, love, and gratitude, how could we withstand it as we do; how could we refrain from being melted into tenderness, and rushing into communion with it, but for the words of truth itself, which bid us prefer It to the whole world?"—(*Tracts; Records of the Church*, No. 24, p. 7,

Note.) But, however this may be, it is not the question, as has been before stated, with which we are concerned. It matters not whether these views be Popish or half-popish, or like Popery; or whether their several authors admit or deny the approximation. We only ask once more, "Are they judicious writers? do they rightly state the character of Protestant divinity? are they fit guides of public opinion? are they fit censors of others?"

THE END.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD-STREET-HILL.

3

DR. HAMPDEN'S

THEOLOGICAL STATEMENTS

AND THE

THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

COMPARED.

BY A RESIDENT MEMBER OF CONVOCATION.

E. B. Pusey

WITH A PREFACE by

AND

PROPOSITIONS EXTRACTED FROM HIS WORKS.

Is there not a cause?

OXFORD,
PRINTED BY W. BAXTER:
SOLD BY J. H. PARKER; AND BY MESSRS. RIVINGTON,
LONDON.
1836.

PREFACE.

THE following tables are intended as a supplement to the "Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements," recently published.

The theological views, which Dr. Hampden has of late adopted, are therein very candidly summed up, and that as much as possible in Dr. Hampden's own words; yet the right fear of over-stating or colouring that writer's views, appears to have led the author of the Elucidations rather to understate them. The passages therein selected from Dr. Hampden's writings (and this has been done with great judgment and care) carry with them a far more decided condemnation than any summary of his views could exhibit, or than the mild author of the "Elucidations" has allowed himself to pass. Another course, however, equally fair to Dr. Hampden, appeared to be open, whereby the Church generally, might (without the intermixture of any comments) be informed of the danger which threatens her, from the principles now transplanted into her theology. And this was, by simply extracting the words of Dr. Hampden, and setting them side by side with her Articles.

This, however, it should be plainly understood, is not done with any idea of passing judgment upon the personal faith of Dr. H. On the contrary, we believe that the earlier faith planted in the soul yet survives,

and we trust and pray that it may survive, unharmed, if possible, by the later philosophical system, which has been admitted into the intellect. This is a very frequent case: it is a blessing annexed by God to religious education, and stedfastness of religious practice. The belief is then so fixed, as not to be readily shaken or destroyed by what, under other circumstances, becomes fatal to it. Hence we see repeatedly, in the history of the Church, persons setting out at different times with the same maxims and principles, but the one following them to Socinianism or infidelity, the other restrained by the power of God within them, and stopping short in the communion of the Church, blessedly, although inconsistently. The heart believeth, while the intellect ought consistently to disbelieve. In a yet extremer case, the Rationalists of Germany have at last seen, what had long ago been pointed out to them by the believing writers, that their position was of all the most inconsistent; that they must, if consistent, return to a sounder faith, or plunge deeper into Pantheism. The division is now being made; some sinking into this form of Atheism, others returning to Christianity. Yet they, for these threescore years, have been boasting themselves of what now appears to have been intellectually inconsistent.

Although, however, through this inconsistency, the evil be often happily mitigated to individuals, it is not less, but even more, dangerous to the Church, on the very ground, that the private character of the individual disguises the danger involved in his tenets. "He has not become a Socinian, or the like," people argue, "what harm is there then in his opinions?" The parallel history of Semler furnishes the answer.

It is notorious that he was the founder of that system, which grew into Rationalism, and is now ending in a form of Atheism. Yet Semler himself was neither Rationalist nor Pantheist; nay, he wrote against an unbelieving writer of the day, whose views were afterwards for the most part adopted by the Rationalists, (the author of the Wolfenbuttel Fragments.) He had been educated in the School of the Pietists; and although an over-confidence in his own powers, and the "thinking of himself more highly than he ought to think," led him to set himself up as a discoverer of the faults of the old Church system, and a teacher of new things, yet he himself was kept back by his early faith from the results to which he led others. At the end of a long life, when he had seen the dreadful harvest, which had sprung from seed sown by himself, he drew back yet further, sheltered himself under what he called and what was "his private religion[a]," and was amazed and grieved

[a] I cannot but subjoin the remark of a Rationalist historian, as shewing the downward course in these cases. Vater had said, (and truly, in the ordinary sense of the terms, although Semler's errors *did* arise in an *un*religious temperament, which he subdued not,) "Semler's proceedings did not in the least arise from any "disinclination to practical Christianity: on the contrary, he was "quite alive to this, and maintained it within himself, distin-"guishing his private religion from his pursuits as a theologian." On this he remarks further in a note, "This his private religion "(whose distinctness he wished to establish as a principle) at-"tached itself, accordingly, to practical Christianity, and retired "behind his investigations, wherein, when he was engaged, *he* "*considered himself as altogether in a different field.* Whereas, "after him, when this same distinction was made, the case was "reversed: the private religion of the preachers was generally "the freest; their public preaching was practical Christianity—

at the work which his own hands had wrought. In like manner, it has well been said of Dr. Hampden's works, that they contain "the major and minor premiss of Socinianism:" we trust that Dr. Hampden may be preserved from the result at which he would consistently arrive; but others, less guarded, undoubtedly will not: one individual, whose writings and maxims forcibly recal to mind those of Dr. Hampden, has already become a disbeliever in the Blessed Trinity.

There is yet another circumstance, which, while it may tend to account for the theory being entertained by Dr. Hampden, without destroying his faith, may yet further illustrate its danger to others. The spiritual danger, too likely to attach to such a theory, would attach for the most part, at least most visibly, either to the mind which originated it, or to those who should receive it into their mind, while as yet immature and unformed. Dr. Hampden has been exposed to neither of these dangers. The theory promulgated in his recent writings has neither been part of the development of his own mind, nor admitted into it at a period when it was likely most to affect that development. It is, in its substance, that which has formed the substance of every negative system, which has assumed the title of Christianity—that whatever in the teaching even of the early and universal Church goes beyond the words of holy Scripture is to be regarded as mere human speculation; that all (whether in the Church, or among those hitherto accounted heretics) who used any phrase

"afterwards, the religion of reason." (Gesch. d. Christl. Kirche, p. 595.)

not employed in holy Scripture, are equally chargeable with speculation; that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, which in the Nicene Creed received the sanction of the whole Christian Church, is not to be regarded as an expression of the form of sound words delivered by the Apostles, (2 Tim. i. 13.) but as the invention of men; that every statement not involved in Scripture words, whether Athanasian, Arian, Socinian, or Pelagian, is alike an addition to the "naked truth" of the Gospel; the one perhaps wandering yet further from the truth than the other, or in Dr. Hampden's words, one "more *obviously injurious* (sic) than the other to the simplicity of the Faith[b];" but all alike speculation; neither admitting of being maintained against the other, neither capable of truth or falsehood. This is the old theory which has been brought forward, whenever the system traditionally received by the Church was to be attacked: the form, in which it is now invested, is borrowed from a modern French philosophy. Received into the mind about the period of middle life, when Dr. Hampden's belief had long been fixed, it may very possibly lie there, an uncongenial and foreign element. It has been received as an ingenious theory; the authorities whereon it rested, partially followed out, subsequently to its reception; but its whole consequences neither perceived nor entertained. Will this be so, however, when it is proposed to immature minds, minds, which in the energy of youth follow out unhesitatingly every theory laid before them, and have as yet no fixed principles to stay them? This is fearful to think of.

[b] Bampt. Lect. p. 378.

It seems then an imperative duty to set before the Church, how entirely at variance the principles and views, contained in the Bampton Lectures of Dr. Hampden, are with the whole Christian faith, as she receives it; that the question is not about the one or the other doctrinal error, (though grave in itself,) but that they are two opposite systems, which cannot stand together: the one must ultimately destroy the other, in any Church, wherein both are entertained. This has been shewn patiently and candidly by the compiler of the following extracts; and the writer of this preface has himself re-examined the passages in the context, and guarantees their fairness and accuracy.

These extracts are, in the writer's judgment, sufficient to shew the opposition between the teaching of Dr. Hampden, and that of the Church. As, however, some of the language used by Dr. Hampden is unusual, and, in fact, all Dr. Hampden's deviations are referrible to one false fundamental principle; it is perhaps fairer towards him, and more faithful to the Church, briefly to state the system, upon which this language is founded.

The object, then, of Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures is briefly stated at their outset. He begins with remarking (p. 1.) on the two obstacles which have counteracted the truths of the Gospel, moral and intellectual, "the self-righteousness of the human heart, and the pride of the human understanding;" and these he designates as "Vice" and "*Theory;* both of which have played a considerable part in the drama of religion." He then states his purpose to be, to set forth the force of the pride of intellect, or "*Theory*, in its relation to the divine truths of our religion;" remarking, that previous investigations have been

confined to the "view of the human passions in their relation to the divine truth, or of human nature in general, in its reception of the Gospel; omitting to shew how the *intellect of man* has *insinuated its own conclusions into the body of the revelation* in the course of its transmission." So, in the words of his Preface, he has "endeavoured to take some account of that resistance, which the human agent has opposed to the diffusion of the truth, as it was purely inspired," (p. vi.) and whereby "the fields of Christ's vineyard have been overrun with thorns and weeds." (Ib. p. viii.)

It is, unhappily, no new observation, that the pride of human intellect and speculation have opposed themselves to the reception of the Gospel. The holy Apostles warned the Church against the influence of "false philosophy," which the heretical impugners of their authority had set up in opposition to the teaching, which they had committed as a deposit with the Church. Until the middle of the last century, it was thought that the Church had long guarded this deposit faithfully, (whence our Reformers, in their contest with Rome, boldly appeal to the six first centuries,) and they traced this influence of "false philosophy," in the speculations of the Gnostics, the profane boldness of the Arians, or the rationalism of the Pelagians; in those, in short, who had set up new teaching, contrary to that, which the universal Church had inherited from the Apostles. Of late, however, men—mere sciolists in Ecclesiatical History—(following the example of Godfrey Arnold) have reversed this statement, and sought to justify the heretics, and impugn the early Church. The peculiarity, then, of the modern view is in its application. Of old this principle was illustrated in the conduct of those without the Church: by moderns, and Dr. Hampden, in

that of the Church herself, and in the doctrinal statements wherein the belief of the whole Christian world has been embodied, and we ourselves to this day have received it.

The distinctive characters, again, of the Greek and the Latin, the speculativeness of the Greek and the practicalness of the Latin, have been long ago observed; whence it happened that the Greek Church had principally to meet speculative, the Latin practical, heresies, i. e. heresies relating to human nature and human powers. On the modern view, however, whereby the evil is to be traced *within* the Church, the speculation of the Greeks is to be found either in their insisting on those solemn words, whereby truths concerning the Divine Nature are declared in holy Scripture, or in those statements, which have hitherto been regarded as closing up the subject against presumptuous speculation [n]; the practical character of the Latins is mainly recognized in the dexterity wherewith they enforced the decisions of the Greek Church, or turned their own controversies into a means of enlarging the spiritual dominion of the Church.

The corrupting speculations thus attributed to the Church, Dr. Hampden has designated by the name of "Scholastic Theology," not, in his sense, the Theology of the Schoolmen commonly so called, but commencing 1000 years before its ultimate decay, (p. 7.) and so including the whole period wherein the Christian Faith was established, and its language on the main Articles fixed by means of the Councils of the universal Church. "This philosophy is an

[n] Dr. H. admits that Origen contradicts his view, but corrects him.

" atmosphere of mist, through which the early beams " of Divine light have been transmitted to us." (p. 8.)

This philosophy, according to Dr. Hampden, is derived partly from Platonism, partly from Aristotle: Platonism furnishing speculations which were amalgamated with Christianity; the logic of Aristotle providing an instrument, and fostering the inclination, of forming human and unauthorized deductions from Divine Truth. " The Church, opposing Platonism, as " a sect jealous of the rising power of Christianity, " still *felt no repugnance to the intermixture of its* " *speculations with the vital truths of religion.*" (p. 11.) " Amidst all the disavowals of the system (of Aris- " totle) which it strenuously made, the Church be- " came unawares Aristotelic. It had learnt the arts " of its impugners, and spoke the language of their " theories in its own authoritative declarations against " them." (p. 12.)

The principle, whereon Dr. Hampden objects to these " theories," is not their character in themselves, or the subjects about which they are conversant, but because he regards them as " deductions;" and, as such, he holds, that without a fresh revelation, it is utterly uncertain whether they be true or false. (p. 55.) All statements of Divine Truth, whether conveyed in Scriptural language or no, so soon as they cease to be statements of a Scriptural *fact*, are, according to him, mere theories. The most accurate comparison of holy Scripture with itself, or the most rigid and cogent deduction from combined Scriptural statements, are uncertain: so soon as we go beyond the mere repetition of the historical *fact* therein contained, we are on the ground of speculation: we then are talking about words only, not of things; about theories, not truths:

even Scriptural language must of necessity be so inadequate to express any truth concerning God, so mixed up with the weakness of the human writer, that it can convey to us no definite knowledge, nor distinct truth. There is, according to Dr. H., no truth, except in the bare facts intimated to us in Scripture. "If it be inquired, then," he says, "why a Logical "Theology should be injurious to the cause of Chris- "tian truth, we must seek an account of the case, "not in the associations of any particular truths of "human reason with those of revelation, but in the "*simple fact of the irrelevance of all deduction of con-* "*sequences, to the establishment of religious doctrine.*" (p. 56.) These deductions Dr. H. proceeds to speak of as "idol abstractions," "phantoms which men have "called into being," (p. 55.) and "episodic additions" to Christianity; (p. 390.) states his conviction that they are "one of the chief causes of the infidelity "which prevails among speculative men," (p. 56.) and "the principal obstacle in all ages to the union "and peace of the Church of Christ." (p. 53.)

The "theories" then to which Dr. Hampden objects, are not the "Scholastic Theology" commonly so called; although even to this Dr. H. is very unjust, and one who should take his notion from him, would form a very false and inadequate notion of those (with all their defects) great men: at all events the peculiar character of *this* theology ceased (as Dr. Hampden admits) at the Reformation: our Articles declare, in more than one place, against its "vain teaching:" *our* Reformers went back to a period long before the Schoolmen, and, connecting our own Church with that of the five or six first centuries, noticed the speculations of the Schoolmen but to condemn them.

"Scholasticism" is a title, which Dr. Hampden has taken out of its historical use, whereby it designates the peculiar speculative theology of the Schoolmen, and has applied it to the statements of Christian truth in the first centuries of the Church, and to the expression of Christian doctrine which was brought out by the Arian or Pelagian heresies, and their several off-shoots. Every statement, accordingly, of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, every Article of the Christian Faith, as received in our Church, (not confined to the bare statements of a scriptural fact,) is comprehended and condemned by Dr. Hampden under this title of "Theory," "Scholasticism," or (as a portion of Scholasticism) "Realism."

The controversies of the Church against the Eastern speculators concerning the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation of our Lord, (Lect. 3.) or against the Pelagians in the West, (Lect. 4, 5.) furnish the principal materials of illustration, (as indeed, upon these turns in great measure the development of the Christian Faith): accordingly, Dr. H. finds the so-called Scholasticism precisely in those points, which have been hitherto regarded as having been decided rightly and finally in the earliest and pure ages of the Church. To these Dr. Hampden has subjoined the doctrine of the Holy Sacraments, supposing it to have flowed from the anti-Pelagian theories, (Lect. 7.) thus animadverting in fact upon the whole range of vital Christian doctrine.

From the universal scepticism, to which this theory legitimately tends, Dr. Hampden has rescued his own faith, by distinguishing between doctrines and certain Scripture facts. Wherein this distinction consists, or what of Divine Truth is thereby left to us, is no

where explained in the Bampton Lectures: the clearest statement I have found, occurs in a passage in the first edition of the "Observations," p. 14, 15. (since suppressed.) "When I say . . . . that the "Christian revelation is *matter of fact*, I intend by it "to express my conviction, that the substance of the "revelation is the *doings and actions of God;* I have "always before my view some *event in the history of* "*God's providences* to which I refer it. In this sense "the truth concerning God is independent of any pe-"culiar wording of it—its proper divine character is "exempted from all alloy which *the imperfection of the* "*writer*, the peculiarity of his circumstances, the idiom "of his language, may accidentally infuse into it."

To this distinction Dr. Hampden was led, in part, by a misapplication of the argument of Bishop Butler. That great Divine silenced, as is well known, the à priori arguments of the Deist, by shewing that he must, if consistent, become an Atheist, since the facts of Christianity, to which he objected, were analogous to other facts in the ordinary government of God; and yet that he cannot be consistently an Atheist, since what is called natural religion is conformable to, and supported by, facts of which we are actually cognizant. Bishop Butler, for instance, parallels with this purpose the fact of the Atonement with analogous facts in God's natural government; "in the same way of goodness, I say, though in a transcendent and infinitely higher degree." p. ii. c. 5. Bishop Butler then was compelled, by his line of argument, to descend to the low ground of comparing facts with facts; for the Deist could not object to the facts of Christianity, unless he first objected to those which he saw actually before his eyes. But what Bishop Butler took for

his lowest ground, to convince "those that are without," Dr. Hampden has taken as comprising the whole of revelation; what Bishop Butler employs *against* à priori objections, Dr. Hampden has changed into an à priori argument; what Bishop Butler maintained negatively, Dr. Hampden has assumed as the sum of his positive truth. He takes up against what he terms a "theoretic logical Christianity," the same ground which Bishop Butler maintained against the unbeliever.

To this Dr. Hampden has probably been further led by the apologetic character of the day. Men have now inured themselves, in all parts of theology, to look to what they can maintain against a rigid opponent, a sceptic within or without Christianity. The next step is to abandon what they cannot so maintain. First, grounds or reasons are given up; then, truths are thrown into the shade; then, forgotten; lastly, denied. It has been fashionable then, for instance, to insist upon the practical character of Christianity, the influential nature of its doctrines, the persuasiveness of its motives, &c. This does not *necessarily* involve the disbelief of such parts as are not obviously practical; but it tends directly thereto. Such doctrines become a burthen unto man, so soon as he sets himself to form a system, into which they refuse to be brought: he cannot any longer maintain them, without violence, on the same ground whereupon he defends the rest. Then he strains some truths, or rather degrades them, (as when the Divinity of our Lord is insisted upon, only, as heightening the greatness of our Redemption,) and so, virtually obliterates whatever of that truth cannot be compressed within the compass of this so-called practical appli-

cation: other truths, which belong to reverential contemplation rather, and are not fitted for every-day impulse upon a mixed multitude, are rudely laid aside, as abstract or unpractical. The principles upon which this distinction is founded, are laid down in a previous work of Dr. Hampden [c].

"The only *conceivable* end of instruction from God "is the good of mankind.—For it is plainly *unreason-* "*able* to suppose that religious doctrines *can* be re- "vealed, to be held merely as credenda, as truths "which ought to be received without reference to "conduct, since a theoretic life is evidently not the "perfect state of a being furnished with active prin- "ciples:" and from this it is inferred that "the sub- "limest doctrines contained in them (the Scriptures "of truth) will all have a practical tendency."

Surely this is presumptuous and unphilosophical, both in its principles and its application; for, 1. it is far more probable, to say the least, that Almighty God produces by all His doings to us infinite number of results, whereof we see scarcely the smallest portion. The good of mankind is *one* purpose, so to speak, of His revelation of Himself to us, assuredly "not the only conceivable end." 2. Because man is "furnished with active principles," it follows not that his whole life consists in outward action; on the contrary, there are in every man two lives, an outward and an inward; a life of thought and a life of action: each indeed affects, but neither excludes the other; nor dare one say that either is altogether *the* end of the other: it *may be* just as much God's will to form in us a certain character of the soul in relation to

[c] Philosophical Evidence, p. 28.

Himself, as a good in itself, without any reference to ulterior consequences, as in relation to our fellow men. The life of activity is, as we often even see, very imperfect, and produces a very imperfect character, if separated from the life of contemplation or meditation; and that, probably even in a higher degree, than the contemplative life would degenerate, if detached from the practical. Each requires to be corrected and heightened by the other. It were then just as probable—if we dared at all to speculate upon probability in these matters—that there should be discoveries of God, which should have no *obvious* connection with our conduct, as that there should not: antecedently, we know nothing one way or the other. But if we find that there are portions of what has always been accounted as the Catholic Faith, which have no such obvious relation to our conduct, or with which, to use the words of an arguer[d] of this sort, only "an ingenious reasoner can contrive to connect practical consequences," surely it becomes us, not to lay them aside as of no consequence, but to enlarge our own narrow notions of what is of "practical consequence." This very narrowness of conception with regard to men's practical character is tending to make them moral or religious machines, instead of realizing their privilege of union with God. This is grounding upon Bishop Butler the very error against which that great man wrote; forming notions beforehand what a revelation must be, and then criticising the revelation by those *à priori* notions. Nay, by limiting all the communications of God to be simply *practical*, in its confined sense, a narrower

[d] Jac. Abbott's Corner Stone, p. 334.

limit is drawn than even by the sceptic, who denied, *à priori*, particular points in the Christian revelation.

3. Granting for awhile this modern axiom, that "The sublimest doctrines must *all* have a practical tendency," it follows not that *we* can *see* that tendency; and if not, then this much-exalted axiom remains a mere abstract proposition, or rather it is a confession that God doth nothing in vain, which is self-evident. But if we, who know not the use of all the portions of our gross material bodies, or of the elements around us, or why the air is so attempered, or how our food nourishes us, presume to say, that we understand how every portion of revealed truth affects our souls, or that we could dispense with portions thereof, or, which is the same thing, that they could not be portions of revealed truth—that they must be human theories—because we see not their use, we lay ourselves open surely to the Apostle's rebuke, "professing themselves to be wise, they became fools."

Such, however, are virtually the results of this theory; and since any knowledge of God in Himself is, by writers of this class, held to be unpractical, all religion is confined to our *relations* to God, or His towards us. All becomes *relative* only. "If[e] the "doctrines taught supernaturally are to be practically "brought home to us, they *must* be of such a nature "as *readily* to combine with those natural principles "of action, which are inculcated upon us by the "course and constitution of the world." "What "else is the instruction of nature, when considered "in its practical form, but general views of the divine

[e] Dr. Hampden, Philosophical Evidence, p. 28—32.

"conduct translated into general rules of human life? "So is it also with respect to the doctrines of Scrip- "ture. Practically considered, they resolve them- "selves into general views of the divine procedure "presented for the guidance of human conduct. As "being a *relative* information concerning God, it re- "presents to us God *acting in some way towards our- "selves.*" "Christianity[f] directs our contemplation "to the steps of the Deity, impressed on the world in "which we live; and instructs us what God *is* (sic) "by what it tells us he has certainly *done* (sic) in "regard to us."

All knowledge, then, of God, out of the narrow bounds of this our earth, is excluded; we know nothing of Him, save as "acting in some way towards ourselves." God is to us, as to the Athenians, "an unknown God." "It[g] is still a *relative* Deity whom Christianity reveals to us, when we learn that there are three Persons in the Unity of the Godhead."

It will be obvious to any one who looks to our Articles and Creeds, what a large portion of the Faith of the Universal Church is cut off by these maxims; and he will be prepared for the Sabellian and indefinite teaching with regard to the Blessed Trinity, which prevails in all Dr. Hampden's writings, as in the School to which he belongs. But Sabellianism, it has been truly said by[h] one who has become aware of the flimsiness of the veil which had long somewhat concealed from him the real state of his religious belief,

[f] Parochial Sermons, p. 25.

[g] Philosophical Evidence, p. 22.

[h] Mr. Blanco White, Preface to Observations on Heresy and Orthodoxy, p. viii.

"SABELLIANISM IS ONLY UNITARIANISM DISGUISED IN WORDS."

The utmost, at which Dr. Hampden arrives in his several statements, amounts but to the negative side of Sabellianism; that we know nothing more of God than as having made three manifestations of Himself, under three different characters, as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Thus, in an earlier work[h], wherein he yet uses the language of the Church as his own, it is in this sense of relation to ourselves only. "It is still a *relative* Deity, whom it (Christianity) "reveals to us, when we learn that there are three "persons in the Unity of the Godhead; for it is only "from being enabled to behold God *in the new distinct* "*relations* of a Redeemer and Sanctifier *superadded to* "*that in which we naturally regard him as* our Father "in heaven, that we are led to the confession of the "co-equal Godhead of the Son and of the Holy "Ghost." The mystery of the Holy Trinity is here explicitly resolved into the mere modes of relation of God to man; whence he consistently infers, that our knowledge from Revelation is "different in *degree*, but the same in *kind*," with that which we have by nature. Again, in the Bampton Lectures, (p. 148.) he maintains that all the theories of the ancient heretics are "Trinitarian in principle," because "they refer to "admitted manifestations of God, *as* the Father, the "Son, and the Holy Spirit." And, again, opposing his notion of Scripture statement to human speculation, he speaks[i] of "the Scripture designation of the great "Divine Cause of all things under the *name* of the "Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."

[h] Philosophical Evidence, 1827, p. 22, 3. [i] p. 115.

In his Parochial Sermons[k] he teaches, "The doctrine "of a Trinity in Unity is the ineffably sublime result "of all that God is related to have *done* in our behalf, "*in that narrative of his providences* which we call the "Bible." "We[l] profess no mere speculative *opinions* (sic) concerning him" [God]: "we[m] do not rest the doctrine upon this or that passage" ["texts, as texts," Dr. Hampden[n] elsewhere teaches, "prove nothing"]; "but we adduce it only in confirmation of a truth, which results from the whole tenor of Scripture; from taking a collective survey of the successive dispensations therein recorded; from *viewing God*, not only *as* the Creator and Governor of the world, *but as* our Saviour in the person of Jesus Christ, *and* our Comforter and Sanctifier in the person of the Holy Ghost."

This in itself is a rationalistic mode of stating the truth, and essentially different from that of our Catechism, of which it is a verbal imitation as far as the difference of the two views admitted; "I believe in God the Father, who made me," &c.; "in GOD the Son who redeemed, &c.; and in GOD the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth me," &c. It is, I mean, essentially distinct, whether we profess our belief in God *as* our Creator, Redeemer, Sanctifier, or in God THE FATHER who created, God THE SON who redeemed, God THE HOLY GHOST who sanctifieth us. Again, every thing depends which way our confession looks, whether it is opposed to the unbeliever or to the Church, whether we are asserting the truth or denying every thing beyond what we state to be true. The latter is the case with

[k] p. 27. [l] p. 32. [m] Ib. p. 29, 30. 32. [n] Observations, p. 15.

Dr. Hampden; for while he asserts doctrines to be facts, he denies any thing to be a *doctrine* which is not also a *fact*, and that also a fact within the compass of this our world.

Into this he has been betrayed by the shallow philosophy of Mr. Locke. Dr. Hampden assumes two points; first, since for the [ordinary] emergencies of life, the knowledge furnished by experience is alone fitted, and our faculties must accordingly be framed to learn by experience, *therefore*, we can have no other faculties, which not being to be exercised upon this ordinary business, need not to be formed by experience:—that because we know things of this earth by experience, therefore, we cannot apprehend things not of this earth intuitively; and therefore God *cannot* impart to us any knowledge, except by the way of experience in this sensible world. Secondly, Since words are *signs* of ideas only, and all our ideas (as before assumed) are only relative, or formed by our own experience, therefore God, in that He employs human language, *can* only impart to us knowledge founded upon our previous ideas, and the same in kind with those ideas. "A light[n] from heaven [*i. e.* "Almighty God, from whom the light cometh] *cannot* "introduce to the mind ideas concerning divine things, "essentially different from all that it ever entered into "the heart of man to conceive."

Consistently, this position must (and unless checked, will) lead to Pantheism, since we *can* form no idea, from experience, of spirit separate from matter, and it is only by Revelation that we know that "God is a Spirit:" it is only by implicitly believing revelation,

[n] Philosophical Evidence, p. 21.

or by a "saltus mortalis" of the human intellect, that we can receive it. Nay, with regard to the human soul, Dr. Hampden thinks that "the [o] popular belief of "its separate existence is a remnant of Scholasticism." How then, on the way of analogy or experience, are we to arrive at the idea of any thing so high as even the "anima mundi" of Spinozism? Rather men must stop in a materialist-Pantheism, wherein not only the world is a part of God, but is God.

The vague mode of teaching involved in these principles has been above noticed: so that *e. g.* all the positive statements on the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity in Dr. Hampden's Bampton Lectures, (written on a foundation for the maintenance of sound doctrine) amount to certain statements that there are "mysterious [p] *facts* of the Trinity," "sacred *facts* [q] of Divine "Providence, which we comprehensively denote by "the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, distinct from the "theories couched under a logical phraseology. I firmly "and devoutly believe that *word*, which has declared "the [r] *Name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the "Holy Ghost:" (as opposed however to that "exact-"ness of thought upon the subject, on which our "technical language is based.") And yet all the "theories" of the ancient heretics are said to have been "Trinitarian in principle," in that "they refer "to admitted manifestations of God, *as* the Father, "the Son, and the Holy Spirit [s]."

So again the doctrine of the Atonement is resolved into the "*fact*, that we cannot be at peace without "some *consciousness* of atonement made," (so that

[o] Bampton Lectures, p. 310. [p] Ib. p. 119. [q] Ib. p. 150.
[r] See above, p. xx. [s] Ib. p. 148.

atonement means a conscious want of atonement:) and this *fact*[t], that the human heart is inexorable against *itself*, cannot forgive *itself*, we are told, "Scripture has met with a parallel fact, the perfect "righteousness of Christ, which it has *connected* with "our unrighteousness."

"Original Sin" again is resolved into "the fact[u], "that there is a *tendency* to sin existing in human "nature," and with this the "Orthodox," we are told, "ought to have contented themselves."

Grace "is a general *fact*[x], a summary designation "of the various instances of benevolent, pitiful, con-"descension on the part of God to the want and "helplessness of man."

This vagueness alone has, in all past experience, (in Germany as in this country,) led in the next generation to a mere negative religion of reason: in this instance it is accompanied with direct opposition to the teaching of Holy Scripture as well as of the Church. For, in conformity to his statements of the inadequacy of all language, Dr. Hampden denies that it is *possible* for God to introduce to the "soul, ideas wholly new of divine things:" words remain but signs, and those "signs being appropriate to the thoughts of the human mind," must partake of the imperfection of that mind, and so "all deduction of consequences" must be "irrelevant to the establishment of religious doctrine[y]." Dr. Hampden speaks more clearly in another place[z]. "I shall only briefly touch here a *fundamental characteristic* of the Christian Scriptures, which *totally precludes all* deduction

[t] Ib. p. 252. [u] Ib. p. 224. [x] Ib. p. 187. [y] Ib. p. 54.
[z] Observ. p. 13, 14.

of speculative conclusions concerning religious truth .... If .... we have no other information of divine things, but in the *facts* recorded in Scripture, a very important principle results .... and it is no other than what I have undertaken to establish, namely, that no speculative deductions from Scripture carry with them the force of divine truth. Pious opinions, indeed, we may form; it is hardly possible practically to avoid exercising the mind in reasoning and speculating on the given truths of Scripture .... But pious opinions, it must be observed, are not parts of revelation." And again[z]: "Strictly to speak in the "Scripture itself, there are no DOCTRINES. What we "read there is *matter of fact*. Some[a] perhaps will "say, 'an inspired writer has said thus, or thus— "this then, as asserted by him, is matter of fact' .... "The expression 'matter of fact' will doubtless ad- "mit this sense. But to interpret the Scripture reve- "lation in this manner, is only to return to the "assertion of its dogmatic character under another "form. It brings us back to take *the words or propo- "sitions written by the inspired writers* as the *substance* "of the revelation, instead of looking to *the authen- "ticated dealings of God in the world.*"

The sum is, that the Holy Spirit *cannot* so mould and temper the language of men as that its language or propositions can convey any knowledge otherwise than as they relate to a physical fact.

This also he represents to be just as absurd, as[b] "in *natural* science," for one to "draw[c] conclusions "concerning the course of nature from the terms in

[z] p. 374. [a] Observ. p. 14. ed. 1. [b] Ib. p. 15, 16. ed. 2.

received in the Church, was founded upon human theory; and another from Scotus as containing the *original* theory of the Sacraments. Yet no distinction is ever made by Dr. H.: nay, immediately after a citation from Aquinas, we find as an inference, "the or-" thodox theory of the Trinity, *accordingly*, consisted in " an exact scientific view of the theory of causation." (p. 118.) It will hardly be credited, that in the Lecture and the notes on the Trinitarian Controversies, not a single original Greek authority (except the later Damascenus) is quoted upon any point connected with those controversies, or with the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord, or the Procession of the Holy Spirit; and yet upon the quotation of a few Schoolmen (principally Aquinas,) the theoretic or speculative character of the Church's doctrine upon these truths is alleged to be proved. And yet Dr. H. speaks of having illustrated the *origin* of our " theo-" logical vocabulary on this sacred subject;" (p. 145.) of " establishing an induction of the force of logical " theories in the existing views and statements of the " Trinitarian doctrines;" (p. 125.) of having " suc-" cessfully established the *desired* conclusion," (p. 389.) And yet even if the early Church and Schoolmen had altogether agreed, it were manifest, that, in order to gain that vivid knowledge, which is necessary to understand the origin and real character of things, a thorough acquaintance with the original sources would alone suffice. On the Holy Sacraments, again, the authorities are drawn entirely from the later Schoolmen; St. Augustin and St. Cyprian alone of the Fathers are quoted, and that on points wholly collateral. There is not even an attempt to trace the doctrine concerning the Eucharist; of baptism we are told that " extrava-

gant opinions of its sacramental powers" existed before the time of St. Augustin: (p. 327.) and yet the doctrine of our Church with regard to the Eucharist is concluded to be Scholastic, because "Ridley and Cranmer derived their *first ray of light* on that subject from Ratramn," (p. 320.) and the doctrine concerning the two Sacraments of our Lord is identified completely with that of the other five, added by the later Church of Rome. (p. 313, seq. 399.)

It has been necessary in part to enter into this statement, in order to avoid the appearance of unfairness, if, (as may have happened) in any place in the following parallels, Dr. Hampden had been charged with blaming the doctrine of the Christian Church, when he was only blaming a speculation of Aquinas. Dr. Hampden might have chosen this line, of illustrating from the Schoolmen the dangers of speculation or over-ratiocination in matters of faith; but he has not: the Schoolmen are to him the representatives only of the rest of the Christian Church: it is not a past dead form, but "the spirit of Scholasti-
"cism which still lives among us, and whose influence
"we feel, although we do not *acknowledge* submission
"to its empire," (p. 387.) which he has undertaken to oppose: the statements of the Schoolmen are throughout identified with all positive statements of Christian doctrine. Dr. Hampden uses their language as the expression of the speculation which he condemns.

I mention this, not as if such passages had been often alleged in the following extracts, but lest the occasional and indeed rare use of such a passage (as under Art. 2.) should not be appreciated by those unacquainted with Dr. Hampden's theory.

I cannot refrain, in conclusion, from protesting

earnestly against the harsh, and often bitter and sarcastic language[a] employed by Dr. Hampden

[a] As; "The parallel [between St. Paul and St. Augustin] only "fails, when we think of the frankness and simplicity of the "Apostle, compared with the shrewdness and versatility of the "saint," p. 19. "when the authors were dead, and the reputed "sanctity of their lives diffused a savour of religion over their "speculations, then the value of such subtile defences of the "doctrine of the Church, &c." p. 41.

"What is now called Calvinism, would not be opposed by a "*dogmatic* (sic) statement, until the profession of the theory was "become notorious, and troublesome to the leading Clergy of the "times." p. 185.

"It would appear that the authorities of the Church objected "only to the employment of logic in discussing questions of "religion, when it was found a vexatious instrument in the hands "of the heretic. When the disputant professed an agreement "with the prescriptive views of the Church, there was no ob-"jection to the use of subtleties, which otherwise incurred the "severity of reprobation and invective. Even sophisms[1], it was "conceded, might be rightly employed, when the design was to "establish the orthodox truth, and subvert the false and delusive "conclusions of heresy. Thus was a sort of Lacedæmonian "policy pursued, &c. &c." (p. 60.)

"Anselm of Canterbury, himself an acute reasoner, to whom "the opinion of Roscelin was reported as a matter of heresy, had "the candour to suspect the justness of the imputation. But as "the oracle of orthodoxy of his time, Anselm still felt himself "called upon to check the progress of the *heretical* logic. By "his active vigilance both as a writer and a governor of the "Church, the offending Nominalist was silenced." (p. 70.) "Thus did the theologians of the Schools, with dutiful officious-"ness, gather up the fragments of revealed truth." (p. 91.) "This field of disputation, (the questions of human agency "involved in the Pelagian controversies) as a part of Christian "Theology, was left open to the *busy* intellect of the Latin

[1] This is simply a mistake; σόφισμα is used, in a good sense, for "acute reasoning," as is also σοφίζομαι: see Suicer on the latter.

towards the Fathers of the Christian Church, and whole classes of God's departed servants. Indeed the language generally employed towards those of old time, the ironical use of the words "orthodox" and "heretical," and the whole view of the Latin Church[b],

"Divines." (p.156.) "In the fact itself, as appears, they (Pelagius "and Celestius) did not differ from the orthodox, so far that they "were acquitted of heresy both at Rome and at Jerusalem. But "the *acute logic of the African* divines (St. Augustin) traced their "explanations to their consequences." (p. 231.) "Both Pelagius "and Celestius disclaimed the imputation; but the logical con-"sequence was sufficient for a conviction of heresy. The "Orthodox clung to their term Nature, as indispensable to the "theory of Grace. In order to secure, as it were, a raft on "which the noxious contagion might float down the stream "of human generation, they insisted on the term Nature as the "only proper designation of the moral fact." (p. 233. Add p. 458 on the companions of St. Athanasius.)

"The acrimony of Jerome was *immediately*[2] called into action, "and he pours forth a torrent of invective, the fruit of a night's "lucubration, against the *unhappy* Vigilantius, or Dormitantius, "as he parodies the name." (p. 405.)

"The alarm would soon spread; the *leaders* of *orthodoxy* would "be *roused* to vindicate the *sacred* cause. The *heretic philosopher* "would be called on for his defence," &c.—p. 120.

[b] "It appears to me, that the silence respecting the author of "the Athanasian Creed was *designed*, or at least his name was

[2] Dr. H. omits to state what Guizot, from whom he takes his account, mentions (Hist. Mod. i. 150.), that *two years* had elapsed since St. Jerome had first been apprised of the character of Vigilantius' writings; and, in commenting on the "acrimony of Jerome," he omits to notice the coarseness of the assault of Vigilantius, who had assailed the Church as "cinerarii et idololatræ" (Hieron. Ep. ad Ripar.); and accused them falsely of worshipping relics. Vigilantius appears to have been a coarse-minded and vain-glorious man: he was originally an inn-keeper; and, but slightly versed in Scripture, wrote some frivolous and heretical things, although, in some respects, well-meaning. (See Gennad. de VV. Ill. c. 35.) But Dr. H. uniformly takes part with the "reputed heretics" (p. 120.) against the Church. The foundation of the character of St. Augustine (p. 20, 21.) is, again, from Guizot (i. 211, 12.); although the colouring is Dr. Hampden's.

as being governed by a carnal, ambitious policy, as well in its stand against Pelagianism as against

" forgotten, *in the wish to give a higher authority* to the document, " and that its reception by us in its present form, as the 'symbol' " or 'faith' of Athanasius, is an evidence of the *triumph of a* " *party in the Church*," &c.

" The Greek placed 'the sword of Aristotle' in the hand of " the Latin; but the spiritual legionary of Rome girded it on, " and cleft with it the way for the orthodox truth through the " opposing ranks of heresy and infidelity." (p. 105.) " As a " practical man, *bent on carrying a point of Church Government*, " he (St. Augustine) calls attention to the unpopular consequences " of the Pelagian system." (p. 183.) " The sentence and the " decision of the controversies on Divine and Human Agency " bespeak entirely the practical theology of the Western Divine. " These controversies were of *leading importance in relation to the* " *government of the Church*. Opinions adverse to a belief in the " supremacy of Divine Providence, were also adverse to the " *dependence of the spiritual community on the personal oracles* " of the Divine Will, and visible ministers of the Divine Power " If the real invisible Theocracy were not acknowledged in the " fullest sense, the principle of *a deputed theocratic power would* " *sink in estimation* at the same time; and the hearts of the " people would be seduced from that loyalty, with which the " *sacerdotal ministrations* had been hitherto attended. So that, " even though the logic of Pelagius, and the known purity of his " character, might have acquitted him from the charge of teach- " ing a doctrine of ingratitude and rebellion against God; yet it " was probable, that discussions touching the nature and " necessity of Divine Grace, if they amounted only to a *mode-* " *ration of language* on the subject, would raise questionings " and unsettle the faith of many. Practical men would readily " see this; and regarding the matter, not as a point of dispu- " tation, but as a *question of government*, would take their " measures against consequences probable in fact, rather than " against the abstract speculation itself." (p. 159.) See also below, p. 36, note [a], &c. " The history of the Sacraments in " the Scholastic system is God working by the instrumentality " of man. The theory is of the Divine Causation; but the

Arianism, remind one of the language and views of the infidel Gibbon, but one should not have expected them in the work of a Christian theologian.

In like manner, after the term "rationalism" had been appropriated to a most offensive, proud, and superficial form of infidelity, it had been well for a Christian theologian to have considered, before he adopted the term as one of praise, and maintained the cause of the Rationalists of former days, as Roscelin and Abelard, whose theories were in fact the forerunners of rationalism, profane in their original character, and, if followed out to their fullest consequences, leading to an universal scepticism.

I am persuaded that Dr. Hampden would regret that the tone which his theory has spread over his treatment of the doctrines[c] of the Holy Trinity and

" practical power displayed is the sacerdotal: the necessary " instrument for the conveyance of Divine Grace becoming, " in effect, the principal cause." (p. 341.) See also, on the same subject, below, p. 57, 8, notes a, b. Add B. L. p. 275, 6. p. 292.

[c] Instances will occur under their several heads; one might quote also the incidental expressions, " The abstract curiosity of " the question itself [of the Holy Trinity], and the habit of " disputation, contributed undoubtedly to give an eagerness and " a *relish* to controversies on the Trinity." (p. 101.) " That " *atmosphere of repulsion*, in which it [the " Divine Mystery" of " the Holy Trinity] is invested." (p. 146.) " The truth of the " Trinitarian doctrine emerges from the mists of human specu- " lation, like the bold, naked land, *on which an atmosphere of fog* " *has for a while rested*, and then has been dispersed." (Ib.) " Looking from a distance at the ardour and bitterness with " which minute points of difference were debated in the several " attempts to perfect the theory of the Trinity, we are apt to feel " surprise at the extraordinary excitement; and either to pity, or " to smile at, such apparent waste of intellect and energy. But " such feelings are awakened only by a very superficial view of

the Sacraments, has given much pain to quiet Christians, as profane; and I mention this the rather, as I can express my conviction that such profaneness has arisen from his theory alone, although I must regard the recklessness with which he handles subjects, which form part of the faith of ordinary Christians, as an evil characteristic of that theory.

I could almost have hoped that the following comparison of Dr. Hampden's views with the Articles of his Church might even have startled himself; but that the unhappy habit of criticising the whole Christian Church from its foundation downwards, to which he has given way in the Bampton Lectures, has a tendency to weaken the regard for the authority of that Church, which has been our common parent, and through whom we "were brought unto Christ." Yet it may be a warning to others, who heedlessly listen to vague charges, (not against the one or the other expression of individual Fathers, but) against the early Church Catholic collectively. It was thus that Semler began; it was on the ruins of the fabric of the early Church that Rationalism was constructed. To remedy this and other dangers, it were much to be wished that (as has been proposed)

"the case. Adequately to conceive the interest of theological "questions at the period when they were most keenly agitated, "we must view them under a *political* aspect." (p. 101.) "The "*keenness* of the Occidentals on the Trinity," &c. (p. 106.) And upon the Sacraments: "It appears that the simplicity of Scrip-"ture truth has been altogether abandoned, *in the endeavours to* "*raise up*, on the solemn ordinances appointed by our Lord for the "edification and charity and comfort of his Church, *an elaborate* "*artificial system of mystical theurgy*." (p. 341.) See also below, p. 58. What also can the expression mean, "The commentaries "*lavished* on the book of Canticles?" See below, p. 28.

those whose leisure is not demanded by other duties, would unite, (like the authors of the great ecclesiastical history of Germany, the Centuries of Magdeburg) in forming a solid history of the Church, which, without entering into the wearisome field of temporary controversy, might oppose a firm bulwark against this, and other, unhistorical perversions of the truth.

The present subject is of the more importance, since principles similar to those of Dr. Hampden are already in circulation among us in a more popular form, (although happily not in the native productions of this country,) and there are unhappily too many notions afloat, whose consequences, those who hold them, do not see, but which are tending to the same end. On this ground it seemed to me important, that persons should see clearly what principles are laid down in Dr. Hampden's works, that they may be warned, whither these kindred maxims tend. I have therefore, given a series of propositions, such as occur in the following extracts, in some cases preserving his actual words, in others, changing the grammatical construction only, so far as was necessary in order to form them into propositions, or supplying some words from the context, but keeping as far as possible his own words, and rigidly attending to the scope of the whole passage. Their correctness will appear to any one, who shall examine the context as attentively. The statements would have appeared much stronger, had I ventured to translate them into popular language; but this would have been to undertake the character of a Commentator more than I wished, and might have seemed to be addressed to popular feeling. I have, in consequence, upon some important sub-

jects, given propositions resembling each other, but each in some degree tending to limit or mark out the meaning of the other, leaving it to the reader to compare them, instead of stating in my own words what seemed to me the unavoidable result.

The compiler of the parallels collected the passages illustrative of Dr. Hampden's phraseology.

The above remarks were extorted by the necessity of explaining the object of these parallels, and the character of Dr. Hampden's theory. The writer is well aware that he has undertaken an invidious task, and he would gladly have been spared; but events brought it into his way, so he could not shrink from it. Convinced as he has been, now for some years, that a crisis is impending over our Church, upon which her efficiency as an instrument in God's hand, or her very existence, will depend; convinced also that, amid much resemblance, there are even more alarming phænomena in this day than there were in Germany in the days of Semler; he dares not regard any obloquy. Whoever would serve his Saviour faithfully, must hold on "through evil report and good report," and count as nothing the praise or the censure of man. In former days Christians were called upon to give up their lives cheerfully; now they must take as cheerfully any imputations, which meet them in the cause of truth. The Gallios of this world, who "care for none of these things," cannot understand that others should be deeply concerned about them; they cannot then but ascribe any earnestness about such things to party-spirit, personal animosity, or the rest of the human passions. "Let them curse, but bless THOU."

E. B. PUSEY.

CHRIST CHURCH, *March* 12.

Propositions maintained in Dr. Hampden's Works.

TRINITARIAN ARTICLES.

1. Our Reformers, in giving the first place to the doctrines relating to the Trinity, were influenced by the discipline of the modern Church of Rome, whose bonds they had thrown off.—B. L. p. 99.

2. *Dialectical Science* . . . . established that peculiar phraseology which we now use, in speaking of the Sacred Trinity as *Three Persons* and *One God.*—p. 130.

3. The whole discussion [on the Blessed Trinity] was fundamentally dialectical.—p. 104.

4. No one can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject of the Holy Trinity, on which our technical language is based.—p. 150.

5. The reality of those sacred facts of Divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, is not to be identified with the theories couched under a logical phraseology [received in the Church.]—Ib.

6. Revelation teaches us only, that God has manifested himself *relatively to us,* as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.—Sup.

7. We have no knowledge beyond what is *relative* to our nature and condition in this world.—M. P. p. 6.

8. All the ancient heresies were Trinitarian in principle.—B. L. p. 148.

9. All the differences of opinion, which have ever prevailed upon the doctrine of the Trinity, relate to the history of the human mind as much as to theology; and do not affect the Catholic Faith.—p. 149.

10. It matters little, which opinion has been *prior,* has been advocated with the shrewdest wit, or *deepest learning,* has been most popular, *most extensively received.*—Ib.

11. The only Catholic truth is the Scriptural fact. [i. e. the events of Divine Providence related in Scripture.]—Ib.

12. The orthodox *theory* of the Trinity . . . . consisted in an *exact scientific view of the principle of Causation.*—p. 118.

13. Unitarians, in that they acknowledge the great fundamental facts of the Bible, do not really differ *in religion* from other Christians.—Observ. p. 20, 21.

14. The revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the *oneness* of the Deity.—p. 147.

15. It was merely a denial of polytheism, but no revelation of Almighty God as numerically one.—p. 146, 7.

16. Materialism intruded itself into what was considered the orthodox view of the Divine Proceeding.—p. 123.

17. There is much of the language of Platonism in the speculation on the Generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit.—p. 117.

18. The orthodox language, declaring the Son "*begotten* before all worlds, *of one substance* (sic) with the Father," was settled by a philosophy, wherein the principles of different sciences were confounded.—p. 137.

19. The account of the Incarnation itself was more peculiarly logical; still there was a mixture of physical speculation.—p. 137.

20. The excellence of the Orthodox theory [of the union of the two natures in Christ] consisted in reducing the definition to perfect consistency with the *original theory of the Divine Procession.*—p. 139.

21. The divine part of Christianity is its facts; the received statements of doctrines are only episodic additions, some out of infinite theories which may be raised on the texts of Scripture.—p. 390.

22. The application of the term punishment to the *sacrifice* of our Saviour belongs to the Aristotelic philosophy.—p. 250.

23. The bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was, that it depressed the power of *man* too low.—p. 253.

24. Christ is emphatically *said* to be our Atonement, not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that *we may know* (sic) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him* (sic).—Ib.

25. "Atonement" in its true practical sense expresses the fact, that *we* cannot be at peace, without some consciousness of Atonement made, not that God may forgive us, but that we may forgive ourselves.—p. 252.

26. The true Scriptural practical view of *Human Agency* is to be seen in the great truth of Atonement, simply believed and acted on, without the gloss of commentators, or the *refinements* of *theorists.*—p. 254.

27. The truths of human sinfulness, of repentance, of atonement, and satisfaction made for sin, are only varied expressions of the great law, that much is in our power, and much out of it.—p. 254-6. Of which general law, the fact of the death of Christ is a transcendent instance.—Observ. p. 18.

28. The *simple* meaning of the Atonement is, that God is infinitely just and merciful, that we cannot please Him by our works, or our sacrifices, or our prayers, but yet *we* can do all things, by Christ strengthening us, working for us, offering Himself for us, praying for us.—p. 254.

29. Our Saviour's mode of speaking, that *virtue* had gone out of Him, is characteristic of *the prevalent idea,* concerning the operation of Divine Influence, as of something passing from one body to another.—p. 315.

30. Our Saviour, in accompanying His miracles with significant actions, *condescended* to the prejudices of His followers, who believed that His word or His touch acted after the manner of secret agents in nature.—p. 314, 5.

HOLY SCRIPTURE.

1. The imperfection of the writers [of Scripture] may accidentally infuse alloy into the character of the truths concerning God.—Observ. p. 15. (First Edit.)

2. We are not to regard the Scriptures, as having God for their proper subject, but as a divine history of man.—B. L. p. 89.

3. To make it our business, to collect into one theory every scattered intimation of the Divine Being and attributes, is a result of this false view.—Ib.

4. We are not to take *the words or propositions written by the inspired writers* as the *substance* of the revelation, instead of looking to the *authenticated dealings of God in the world.*—Observ. p. 14. (First Edit.)

5. The truth concerning God is independent of any peculiar wording of it in Scripture.—Observ. p. 15. (First Edit.)

6. A reception of the Scripture, not simply as the living word of God, but as *containing* the sacred *propositions* of inspired wisdom, is an improperly directed veneration.—B. L. p. 91.

7. There are no propositions concerning God in Scripture, detached from some *event* of Divine Providence . . . Texts, *as texts*, (sic) prove nothing: texts establish Divine truths only as indices to real *facts* in the history of Divine providence."—Observ. p.14, 15. (First Edit.)

8. Strictly to speak, in the Scripture itself there are no DOCTRINES.—B. L. p. 374.

9. The Apostolic Epistles contain no *doctrinal* statements.—Ib.

10. No speculative deductions from Scripture carry with them the force of divine truth.—Observ. p. 12.

11. No intellectual, or speculative, or theological conclusions, are to be drawn from truths of Scripture; no conclusions of human reasoning, however correctly deduced, however logically sound, are properly religious truth.—Ib. p. 12, and 8.

12. What *can be proved* out of Scripture is not *therefore* truth of revelation.—Ib. p. 9.

13. A participation of Deity, or an actual Deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the *operation* of *Grace* according to the Schoolmen, and is a pantheistic notion. (Comp. θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. 2 Pet. i. 4.)—B. L. p. 197.

14. No further proof of the extravagant mysticism of contemplation in the system of the Schoolmen is required, than the commentaries *lavished* on the Book of Canticles at the different periods of Scholasticism.—p. 84.

15. The assertion, that the Fathers "looked not for transitory promises" is to be traced to the *Scholastic* distinction between implicit and explicit faith.—p. 239.

CREEDS AND ARTICLES.

1. The notions on which the several expressions of the Articles at large, and in particular of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, are founded, are both unphilosophical and unscriptural, belong to ancient theories of philosophy, and are only less obviously injurious to the simplicity of the Faith than those which they exclude.—p. 378. (Compare Observ. p. 23, 4.)

2. The speculative language of these Creeds was admitted into the Church of England, as established by the Reformers, before the genius of Bacon exposed the *emptiness* of the system, which the Schools had palmed upon the world, as the only instrument for the discovery of all truth.—Ib.

3. Experience proves, that the naked truth of God has been overborne and obscured by the phraseology which Orthodoxy was forced to employ.—p. 377.

4. The *reputed* orthodox, as well as the *reputed* heretic, were gradually forced into conclusions, and from these conclusions into other premises, at which they might at first have revolted.—p. 120.

5. The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds involve scholastic speculations.—p. 544.

6. The Apostles' Creed contains nothing but facts.—p. 544.

7. The received statements of doctrine, having been created by theological controversy, are a dogmatical and sententious wisdom.—Observ. p. 7, 8.

8. All *opinion, as such, is involuntary in its nature*. It is only a *fallacy*, to invest dissent[a] in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant.—Obs. p. 5.

[a] "Dissent," in Dr. Hampden's language, includes Unitarianism.

9. The *positiveness* of doctrine, arising from the very nature of systematic statements, is an evil.—B. L. p. 238.

10. Articles of religious communion become fatally adverse to all theological improvements.—Observ. p. 10.

ORIGINAL SIN.

1. The language of the Article on Original Sin bears the *impress* of the Scholastic *theories*.—p. 228.

2. There is in the Article on Original Sin a *train of thought* on the subject *following the speculations* of the Schools.—Ib.

3. The Orthodox ought to have contented themselves with the *name* of Original Sin, to designate the moral *fact* of the *tendency* (sic) to sin, in human nature.—p. 224.

.4 In defining and pronouncing upon it, they essayed, what Scripture had not authorized, to explain the mode of human corruption.—p. 224, 5.

5. The Pelagians asserted that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by *propagation* but by *example:* though their language inadequately expresses the inveteracy of the sinfulness of human nature, *their grounds were right*, so far as they attempted to give a *moral* account of the fact; and *their opponents were wrong*, so far as they attempted to give a *physical* or *material* account of it.—p. 222, 3.

6. The term *propagation* ("engendered" Art. IX.) was introduced into the account of the origin of evil, in order to *prove* its universality.—p. 221.

7. A positive deterioration of our carnal nature is a Scholastic notion.—p. 225.

8. The strength of the expression 'very far gone from original righteousness,' is to be estimated, by comparing the fallen condition of man with the Scholastic notion of his first estate.—p. 228.

9. The belief, that, to counteract the living death, in which we by nature are, a new life from God must be imparted, is a consequence of the Scholastic notion of original sin.—p. 235.

10. The idea, that the corruption of nature exists in infants, is the result of Theory.—p. 221.

HUMAN WILL.

1. When we will to do any thing, *it is in our power to will* either *to do* or not to do it; . . . it is, in the strictest sense, competent to us *to will* (sic) to act in this way or that way. Herein resides the proper freedom of the will of man.—M. P. p. 79, 80.

2. It is the part of sound *philosophy* to *strengthen* the *power* of the will by *immediate* address to itself.—Ib. p. 91.

3. In moral action, *man holds sway* with a *supremacy*, delegated indeed from the Sovereign Ruler of the universe, but *absolute*.—M. P. p. 86.

4. It is man's high prerogative to be, in a great degree, a *creature of his own making; he can* modify and *transform himself*, as a *moral being, as he pleases;* what he *may become* (sic) depends almost solely on what he *may will* (sic).—Ib. p. 84.

FAITH.

1. The *priority*, which is ascribed in such strong terms in our Articles to Faith, among the acts of the Christian life, is accounted for by the *physical* notion of faith as an *infused* principle, the *origin* of a new life, held by the Schoolmen.—B. L. p. 236, 7.

2. The notion that Faith is a source of the knowledge of God, is derived from an eclectic philosophy, in which the mysticism of Plato was blended with the analytic method of Aristotle.—p. 80.

3. The difficulties attending the notion of *Faith* and of *Works done before Justification*, may to a great extent be attributed to the abstract *theories* preserved in the technical language of Theology.—p. 238.

4. Faith ought to have been held in a negative sense only.—Ib.

5. A *belief of our Justification by faith*, separated from *natural* convictions of *duty*, rushes into the fearful extreme of antinomianism. . .—M. P. p. 101, 2.

6. Faith and Reason are not distinct principles.—B. L. p. 350 sqq.

GRACE.

1. The positive sense of grace is derived from Scholasticism.—B. L. p. 188.

2. When we are desired to pray for 'grace,'—and 'grace' is said to be given to us, a dogmatic impression is conveyed; but more strictly, they are *concise modes of speaking*, for the purpose of giving a distinct and striking view of *the fact* of God's benevolent condescension.—Ib.

3. Those subdivisions .... of 'preventing' and 'following' grace, grace 'operating' and 'cooperating,' and others which our Church has not adopted, are expressly taken from the Scholastic Theology.—Ib.

4. The conception produced in the mind by speaking of grace *operating* and *cooperating*, grace *preventing* and *following*, is very erroneous.—p. 187.

5. To regard Grace as something 'infused' into the soul, by virtue of which the sinner is justified, and the operation of which on the heart is to be traced through the stages of its process, is part of the Scholastic system. —p. 188, 9.

THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

1. The doctrine of the Sacraments is based upon the mystical philosophy of secret agents in nature, christianized.—p. 314, 5.

2. The ready reception of the theory, that Christ, as the sole primary cause of grace, conveyed that grace through the Sacraments, as subordinate instrumental causes, by which the Divine agency accomplished *its* ends, is sufficiently accounted for by the general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church.—Ib.

3. The notion that the Sacraments are visible channels, through which virtue is conveyed from Christ Himself to his mystical body, the Church, is part of the theoretic view of the Scholastic Philosophy.—p. 311.

4. The assertion of a real and true presence of Christ in the Eucharist resulted from the original *Platonism* of the Church.—p. 72.

5. The Church of England doctrine of the Sacrament is founded on the views of an author, who asserted this.—p. 320. She has, though in a modified form, preserved the fundamental idea of the Scholastic doctrine. —p. 313.

6. It was in just logical connection with the Scholastic theory [preserved by the Church of England] that the Latin theology deduced the seven sacraments of the Church of Rome.—p. 313.

7. The whole doctrine and ritual of Christianity in the system of the Church of Rome, may be drawn from this primary notion of sacramental *efficiency*.—p. 321.

8. The faith of the receiver is the true *consecrating* principle of the Sacraments.—p. 323.

9. The inquiries in our Baptismal Service, "With what *matter* was this child baptized?" "With *what words*" &c. "Because some things," it is said, "*essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted," are derived from the subtle speculations about *matter* and *form*, introduced to establish and perfect the theory of *instrumental efficiency* ascribed to the rites themselves.—p. 336.

10. The use of the expressions, being made a "member of the body of Christ," or being "incorporated" ("engrafted into the Church," Art. XXVII.) as equivalent, is owing to the *confusion of ideas* prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism.—p. 324, 5.

11. The decision as to the intrinsic *efficacy* of the rite of Baptism can be only speculation.—p. 344.

12. Conditional Baptism is a Scholastic provision.—p. 327.

13. The statement that the personal vice of the officiating minister could not impede the due consecration of the rite is unnecessary, except on the Scholastic theory of the Sacraments.—p. 323.

14. Had transubstantiation remained as a simple opinion, there might have been no harm in it.—Observ. p. 14, 15.

15. Transubstantiation is connected with the Scholastic Theory of the Trinity.—B. L. p. 535.

RELATION OF NATURAL MORALITY TO RELIGION.

1. Religion lifts up the feelings, but does not give them solidity; it needs philosophy as a counterpoise.—M. P. p. 102.

2. The opinion of the dependence of moral theory on religious truth is, in fact, a remnant of the philosophy of the Middle Ages. Moral Science .... was absorbed in the vortex of Theology.—M. P. p. 23.

3. The maxim, that the business of man is the imitation of God, is derived from Plato, and is the commencement of the confusion of morals and theology.—B. L. p. 271.

4. Religion sums up all its practical energy in the one quality of Resignation; Moral philosophy provides for the duties belonging to the heirs of flesh and blood.—M. P. p. 103.

5. Religion is among the means, which Moral Philosophy employs to exalt and improve the power of man.—M. P. p. 95.

6. The *religious principle* is not to be substituted for morality as the *spring of action*.—B. L. p. 301.

7. The idea of God, as the source of our moral powers, cannot be taken into account in the *science* of morals, without sacrificing its independence. —M. P. p. 76, 7.

8. Christianity leaves Ethical Science, as such, precisely where it found it.—B. L. p. 301.

The popular belief in the separate existence of the soul is a remnant of Scholasticism.—p. 310.

PASSAGES

EXPLANATORY OF

DR. HAMPDEN'S PHRASEOLOGY.

THEORY.

"Christianity had its beginnings amidst obstructions of a twofold character; the self-righteousness of the human heart, and the *presumption of the human understanding*. It had to war with the *pride of man*, entrenched within these double fortifications. Not only were those principles of our nature, on which it was to exercise its sanctifying influence, armed in hostility against it; but those on which it had to rely as the *interpreters* of its overtures of peace and pardon, *misconstrued* and *misrepresented* its heavenly message. . . . .

"There is a *resistance* simply moral, and another simply intellectual;—the force of *Vice* and the force of *Theory*; both of which have played a considerable part in the drama of religion. . . . .

"My purpose in the following Lectures is . . . to endeavour to present to your notice the force of *Theory*, in its relation to the divine truths of our Religion. It is that portion of the inquiry which has attracted the least investigation in itself. For though ecclesiastical histories purpose to give a view of theological opinion, there is none that I am acquainted with, which has given an account of the effect of opinion *as such* on the doctrines of Christianity. They give rather a view of *human passions* in their relation to the divine truth, or of human nature in general in its reception of the Gospel. They do not shew how the *intellect* of *man* has *insinuated its own conclusions* into the body of the Revelation, and modified the expressions by which the truth is conveyed.

"I do not indeed purpose to enter into the whole of so large an inquiry. Nor can I pretend, in the course of the present Lectures, to exhaust even a part of it. I must content myself with laying before you that portion of it which has forcibly struck my own mind; and which, I hope, may also prove both interesting in itself, and important to the result of the whole inquiry into the theoretic modifications of our language.

"It is then to the effect of the *Scholastic Philosophy* that I have directed my attention...."—p. 5-7.

SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY.

"The Scholastic Philosophy, in fact, lies between us at our present station in the world and the immediate diffusion of the *truth* from heaven, as 'the morning spread on the mountains,' an atmosphere of *mist*, through which the early beams of Divine Light have been transfused.... The Scholastic method is.... nothing more than a view of the philosophy of *Aristotle*, as it was moulded by the state of civilization and learning, and by the existing relations between the civil and ecclesiastical powers in the course of the middle ages..... The chairs of theology and philosophy, established here and elsewhere, were the oracular seats from which the doctrines of Aristotle were expounded as the *rationale* of theological and moral truth. The collection of these several authorities and decisions, at length, rose into a peculiar system of Philosophy in itself; of which Aristotle indeed was the foundation and cement, but the structure itself, commentary piled on commentary, and conclusion on conclusion."—p. 8, 9.

...."Christianity had to struggle in its infancy against the theology of the school of Alexandria..... Nor was the mischief from the Alexandrian School neutralized, when, its open hostility being found ineffectual, disciples of that school merged themselves into the Christian name. The accommodation which then took place between the theories of their philosophy and the doctrines of the Faith, proved a snare to members of the Church..... The Faith itself was at

stake in the endeavour to disentangle it from the theories of the Platonizing Christians. . . . . The philosophy of Aristotle, on the contrary, crept into the Church imperceptibly, and even against the consent of the Church. No compromise took place between its disciples and the members of the Church . . . . But . . . . amidst all the disavowals of the system which it strenuously made, the Church became unawares Aristotelic. It had learned the arts of its impugners, and spoke the language of their theories in its own authoritative declarations against them.

"But, in reality, the question of the influence of Aristotle's philosophy is more important on this very account, that it has been more subtile, more silently insinuated into, and spread over *the whole system* of Christian doctrine. . . . . I consider it therefore necessary for the perfect understanding of those terms of our religion, which an established usage has now made the unchangeable records of religious belief, ... to examine, to some extent, how far their history may be traced in the *Aristotelic theories* of Scholasticism."—p. 10—13.

"The Scholastic Philosophy, indeed, is preeminently a record of the struggle which has subsisted, between the efforts of human *reason*, on the one hand, to assert its own independence; and, on the other hand, the coercion exercised over it by the civil or eeclesiastical *powers*."—(p. 13.) "It was such a system as naturally grew out of the struggle continually subsisting in the West between *Reason* and *Authority*."—(p. 53.) "In the general survey of it, it will be observed to be distinguished by two very opposite characteristics: an unbounded liberty of discussion . . . . and a *servile addiction* to the previous determinations and sanctions of the venerated doctors of *the Church* . . . . It was by its *artful* combination of these two ingredients of the human judgment,—the *positiveness of dogmatism*, and the *waywardness of private reason*,—that its empire was decided. To this combination we owe the precision and compass of our theological language."—p. 13, 14.

SPECULATIVE, LOGICAL, PHILOSOPHY.

"We are now tracing to its origin that *speculative logical Christianity* which survives among us at this day, and which has been in all ages *the principal obstacle, as I conceive, to the union and peace of the Church of Christ.* To some, indeed, the assertion may even seem strange, that the cause of Christianity has *suffered to such extent* from the *logical* character of the speculations adopted into its system. They may readily admit in general terms, that the intermixture of *any speculation whatever* with the *body* of religious truth, must be *detrimental* to that truth. But they may not be aware, at the same time, of the evil arising from the purely *logical* character of the speculation. It will be the object of the whole of the present course of Lectures, to point out this mischief. . . .

"If it be enquired, then, why a Logical Theology should be injurious to the cause of Christian truth, we must seek an account of the case, not in the association of any *particular* truths of human reason with those of revelation, but in the simple fact of the *irrelevance* of *all* deduction of consequences to the establishment of religious doctrine . . . . If then it should appear, that the Scholastic Philosophy was in its fundamental character a *Logical* Theology, the nature of that evil which it has imparted into religion will be sufficiently apparent. . . . It will appear, that, whilst theologians of the Schools have thought they were establishing religious *truth* by elaborate argumentation, they have been *only* multiplying and arranging a theological *language.*

"Nor let it be thought that the evil has rested here;—that the mere *futility* of the process has worked its own antidote. Experience tells us that it has not rested here. The *signs* have been converted into *things.* The combination and analysis of words which the Logical Theology has produced, have given occasion to men to arm themselves in defence of the *phantoms* thus called into being. Not only have professed theologians, but private Christians, been *imposed on* by the specious religion of terms in theology; and have be-

trayed often a fond zeal in the service of their *idol-abstractions*, not unlike that of the people of old, who are said to have beaten the air with spears to expel the foreign gods, by whom their country was supposed to be occupied. For my part, I believe it to be one of the chief causes of the *infidelity* which prevails among speculative men."—p. 53-56.

"As defenders of the sacred truth, they (the Church authorities) would justify themselves by an appeal to the manner and the precept of the Scriptures. The Epistles, it would be observed, were for the most part works of controversy. St. Paul is particularly represented in the passage of the Acts, which I have already read, and in other places, as 'disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God.' (Acts xix. 8—11.)[a] The word 'disputing'—in the original διαλεγομένος—would be recognised as the technical term, by which the Greeks denoted their familiar exercise of philosophical discussion; and which gave the name of Dialectic to their original logical science. Again, in the conversations of our Saviour himself, traces would be found of the argumentative method of the ancient Schools: such as the *dilemma* respecting the baptism of John[b]: and the mode in which he sometimes evades a particular question, by putting a question in return. . . . Such passages as these *are* expressly referred to, indeed, by theological writers, in order to prove, that the science of argumentation is a just accomplishment of the Christian who would 'give a reason of the hope that is in him.' Still more, the word *Logos* has been singled out for especial remark; and its application to Christ, as the Reason or Wisdom, and Word, of God, has been cited, as an account of the connexion of Logic, the science of words and reasons, with Christian Theology."—p. 58-60.

[a] "Thus too among the qualifications for the office of a Bishop enumerated in the Epistle to Titus is this: that he should be able to 'convince the gainsayers,' τοὺς ἀντιλέγοντας ἐλέγχειν: an expression being also used here, drawn from the art of the logician. The use of the word ἐρωτάω may be contrasted with αἰτέω in John xvi. 23."

[b] "This instance is still more striking when we refer to the Greek, Matt. xxi. 24. Ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ λόγον ἕνα—expressions which remind us of the Socratic method of disputation—the *erotetic* method by which the Greek sage used to extort the truth from his reluctant opponent in argument.—See also Matt. xxii. 41—46."

"In Scholasticism, accordingly, the *Dialectical Art* was all in all. . . . Theology becoming a science founded on Definitions, . . . was forced to have recourse to the analytical power of *Language*. . . . Language presents a medium of classification to an indefinite extent. But the very medium of classification thus presented, enabling the mind to combine things, independently of actual *observation of facts* with a view to such combination, *imposes on us* by the subtilty and facility of its application. We believe that we have combined *real facts in nature*, when we have only explored and marked *connexions* which *our own minds* have woven together."—p. 86, 7.

REALISM.

"Such then was the Theology of the Schools. It is, in effect, what we designate in a word by *Realism*—the conversion of mere Logical and Metaphysical truth into physical". . . . . p. 87.

"It was *Philosophy held in subordination to Church Authority*. It was that view of the origin of human knowledge which carried men from efforts of *self*-information, from examination of nature, to repose on principles infused into the mind by *dictation from others*. This theory, by assigning what metaphysicians call an *objective* [a]*reality* to the general notions of the mind, made the whole of our knowledge deducible from abstract ideas. A dictatorial and speculative Theology readily combined with such a theory. Men were thus taught to distrust the *senses*; to distrust conclusions from mere *experience*, and to rely only upon the clear consequences of unquestioned speculative principles. It was the maxim *Invisibilia non decipiunt*, made the ground of alliance between Religion and Philosophy. . . . . The triumph of Realism is coincident with the ascendancy of the Scholastic Philosophy."—p. 70-72.

"It may further illustrate the character of a Theology so constructed, to observe the analogy which it bears to the

[a] Compare Mr. Blanco White on the Law of Libel.

personifications of *heathen mythology*. The genius of *Paganism* seized the fancy with some image of loveliness, or mirth, or awe, expressing the tendency of the mind to realize its own abstractions, in the *fabled* beings of a many-peopled heaven. Scholasticism in like manner has its *apotheosis* of *human ideas;* only that here an exact *Logic* has worked the transmutation, which Poetry effected in the other."—p. 87, 8.

Nominalism.

"Nominalism, on the contrary, by denying any bj ective reality to general notions, led the way directly to the testimony of *the senses*, and the conclusions of *experience*.

"Though in the Scholastic age itself, the whole consequences of that theory of human knowledge might not be perceived, it would lead men certainly to think for themselves . . . . For, if it were admitted that the notions of the mind, expressed by general terms, were not the actual representatives of objects existing out of itself, men would no longer depend on abstractions, as their sure and only means of knowledge. They would doubt the *physical* truth of conclusions, resting solely on such evidence. . . . The validity of an appeal to *experience* would, of course, be but tremblingly entertained at such a period, amidst the complete general subjugation of the intellect to the force of *Religious Authority*. And we shall not be surprised, therefore, that the Nominalists of that day, or of the following (twelfth) century, did not push their theory to its full consequences."—p. 71.

Scholastic, Scientific, Logical, Dogmatical, Theology.

"The tendency of the whole system . . . . was to erect Theology into a perfect Science. It set out with the design of enabling the Christian, when assailed on points of heresy, or perplexed with questionings as to truths simply proposed to his belief, to give a *reason* of the doctrines of his Faith. Assuming that matters of Faith might become matters of understanding to those who believed, it attempted to establish, by processes of reasoning from given principles of

Theology, each doctrine of religion, independently of the sacred authority on which it rests in the Scripture. . . . And thus a vast collection of principles was obtained, from which conclusions in Theology might be drawn. . . . At length Theology rose into a regular demonstrative Science. . . .

" Rightly to conceive the nature of this scientific or logical Theology, we must divest our minds of that popular notion of Science, which modern improvements in philosophy have introduced. It is not the reduction and classification of facts, which was understood as Science by the Scholastic Philosopher. His notion of Science was deduced from the ancient philosophy, which considered no knowledge worthy of the name, but such as rested on *fixed indisputable principles*; . . . not, as those collected from *experience* and *observation*, open to exception and contradiction from varied and contradicting experiences; but possessing an intrinsic necessary evidence. . . But to the Christian speculator, under such a method, these principles would, of course, be sought no where else, but in the Divine Being himself. He who alone 'changes not,' would naturally be the point of departure in such a philosophy. His nature and attributes, so far as they were explained by the light of reason, or revealed by the illumination of Scripture, would alone present to the inquirer that immobility and eternity and absolute priority of *truth*, of which he was in quest. . . . .

" The application, again, of the term Truth to the person of Christ, as also of Wisdom to the knowledge of the most sublime and divine things (both in the Scripture and in the works of philosophers), further promoted the erection of Christian theology into that exact theoretic form, which it obtained in the Scholastic system.

" Originating, however, in a combination of the judgments of *speculative Reason* with the prescriptions of *Authority*, the system, at its maturity, exhibits in its internal structure, the result of that conflict of elements, out of which it had grown. Its principles, as I have said, were to be drawn from the nature of the Divine Being; as the only sure ground on which a divine and universal philosophy could fix its first steps. But where was the evidence or criterion of the truth

of those principles? . . . . it was admitted that the nature of God, as He is in himself, is incomprehensible by the human faculties; that we cannot attain in this life to the knowledge of his essence. This difficulty might appear insuperable. But it was not so to the Schoolman versed in an *eclectic philosophy*, in which the *mysticism* of Plato was blended with the *analytic method* of Aristotle. The principle of FAITH here answered the purpose of solving this difficulty, as well as of securing the prescriptive right of Authority. Theology, as a natural knowledge, could not itself discover and establish the principles on which it reasoned. It might however receive those principles, through FAITH, from an higher science, the science or knowledge of God. . . . If we *believe* the Scripture, accordingly, we may proceed to the exercise of *understanding*. . . . The object accordingly to the Scholastic Theology was, to detect and draw forth from the Scripture, by aid of the subtile analysis of the philosophy of Aristotle, the mystical truths of God, on which the Scripture revelation was conceived to be founded. . . . .

"Thus was the *Idealism* of the Platonic School combined with the Sensualism of the Aristotelic. The principles on which the Scholastic Theology here professed to be based, were no other than the *Ideas* of the Divine mind, as assigned by the Platonists of the Alexandrian School. Translated into the language of Aristotle, these Ideas of Platonism became, in the Scholastic system, the *Forms* of things. . . By this substitution of technical phraseology, was the philosophy of Aristotle brought to the support of a *theory*, which in his own writings he has strenuously condemned as a *vain mystification of science*. . . . . "This then was a neutral ground between the two philosophies, on which the Scholastic Theology took its stand. Here, as in a point of contact, met the *theories* peculiar to each, to diffuse themselves afterwards in *a vast system of Realism*. . . . ."—p. 77-83.

"We have seen that the Scholastic Philosophy had for its basis a *theoretic* knowledge of the Divine Being."—(p. 99.) "Generally then, I would observe respecting the controversies on the Trinity, that the only means of arriving at just notions of them is, to be aware of that promiscuous *combination* of

sciences, which formed the ancient Logical Philosophy; and which was adopted into the Christian Church, both as coincident with Theology, and as an organ for the investigation of truth. The several disputations will be found to have for their object; either to explain .... the being and attributes of God on *assumed physical* principles; or to reconcile the various hypotheses .... and illustrate them .... by processes of *argumentation*, and exact *distinctions*. But the two proceedings are continually running into each other; as must be the case where metaphysical truth is only a refined materialism, and physical truth is sought in the abstractions of Metaphysics:—which was eminently the case in the ancient philosophy, and the Scholastic system followed on it. The *pantheism* of the New-Platonists was an extreme case of the application of the *logical* method of philosophizing."—p. 107, 8.

ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

ARTICLES[a]

AGREED UPON

BY THE ARCHBISHOPS AND BISHOPS OF BOTH PROVINCES AND THE WHOLE CLERGY,

IN THE CONVOCATION HOLDEN AT LONDON IN THE YEAR 1562,

For the avoiding of Diversities of Opinions, and for the establishing of consent touching true Religion[b].

---

[a] "Wherever speculative truth is involved, there must be presupposed an opening for improvement; whereas articles of religious communion, from their reference to *the fixed objects of our faith*, assume an immovable character, fatally adverse to all theological improvement. Were it not for the intrinsic sublimity of the subject, the case of adherence to such unvarying formularies, would forcibly strike the minds of men, as no less incongruous and injurious in Religion, than, in Medicine, would be the case of a society of physicians, who should make the maxims of Hippocrates or Galen, the unalterable basis of their profession."—Observ. p. 22.

[b] "In *religion*, properly so called, few Christians, if any (I speak of course of pious minds), really *differ*."—Observ. p. 19.

"What then is the origin of all that variety of religious profession with which the world is distracted? . . . The real causes of separation are to be found in that *confusion* of theological and moral *truth* with *Religion*, which is evidenced in the profession of different sects."—Observ. p. 6, 7.

"In pursuing such an inquiry, we are naturally led to consider the principle on which Christian doctrine takes its rise; that is, whether there is foundation for the common *prejudice*, which identifies systems of doctrine—or theological propositions methodically deduced and stated—with Christianity itself—with the simple *religion* of Jesus Christ, as received into the heart and influencing the conduct."—Observ. p. 3.

"The principle itself is the common fault of us all . . . . the confusion of theological conclusions and opinions with *Religion*."—Observ. p. 21.

"No conclusions of human reasoning, however correctly deduced, however logically sound, are properly *religious truths*."—Observ. p. 8.

"It is these which have been the fruitful source of controversy and error and heresy in the progress of Christianity, and against which, accordingly, the zeal of every lover of the simple faith, as it is in Christ Jesus, ought to be directed."—Observ. p. 13.

"If it should appear, that men in reality differ less in *religious* belief and conduct, than their formularies of doctrine would lead to suppose—that it is chiefly the introduction of *human opinion* into the matter of Revelation that occasions a difference of professions."—Observ. p. 5.

Third Article in the Thirty-Sixth Canon.

" That I allow the Book of Articles of Religion . . . . and that I acknowledge all and every the Articles therein contained, being in number Nine and Thirty, besides the Ratification, to be agreeable to the Word of God."

" By virtue of those very *theological opinions* to which I have declared my assent in *admitting* the Articles of the Church of England, I have signified my denial and *exclusion* of opinions, which I think injurious to Christian truth, and derogatory to the character of a true Church of Christ."—Observ. p. 25.

" This is the view which I take, not only *of our Articles at large*, but in particular of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, as they stand in our Ritual, or are adopted into our Articles. If it be admitted, that the notions in which their several expressions are founded are both *unphilosophical* and *unscriptural*, it must be remembered that they do not impress those notions on the Faith of the Christian, as matters of *affirmative* belief. They only use the terms of ancient theories of philosophy—theories current in the Schools at the time when they were written, to *exclude* others *more obviously* (sic) injurious to the simplicity of the Faith. The *speculative language* of these Creeds, it should be observed, was admitted into the Church of England as established by the Reformers, before the period, when the genius of Bacon exposed the *emptiness* of the system which the Schools had palmed upon the world as the only instrument for the discovery of all truth."—B. L. p. 378.

" Orthodoxy was forced to speak the divine truth *in the terms of heretical speculation*; . . . to employ a phraseology, *by which, as experience proves, the naked truth of God has been overborne and obscured.*"—p. 376, 7.

" Such being the origin of a Dogmatic Theology, it follows, that its proper truth consists in being a collection of *negations*; of negations, I mean, of all ideas imported into Religion, beyond the express sanction of Revelation. . . . It must be strictly confined to the *exclusion* and rejection of all extraneous notions from the subjects of the sacred volume. *Theory* thus regulated, constitutes a true and valuable *philosophy*,—not of Christianity properly so called,—but of *human* Christianity,—of Christianity in the world, as it has been acted on by the force of the human intellect."—p. 377, 8.

" Pious opinions, indeed, we may form. . . . Such, indeed, are the doctrinal statements of our Articles. I may wish there were less of dogmatism in them: still I cannot but approve them for the piety which pervades them."—Observ. p. 14.

" But it will be said by some advocates of our Church, that . . , the doctrines expressed in its formularies are not mere negations and *exclusions* of erroneous opinions—they are derived from the confessors and doctors of the primitive ages of the Church—they have descended to us in pure stream from the fountains of orthodoxy : . . . But granting, for the sake of argument, that the dogmas of the Church are precisely what they were in the earliest age of Christianity; or that such a coincidence, if it existed,

would be a test of a perfect theology, (which I do not admit;) it is evident, at any rate, on examination, that a great deal of the *false* philosophy of former times, is involved in the expressions which convey them." —Observ. p. 23, 24.

"But here the question may be asked, how far on these grounds Creeds and Articles may be retained, when the original occasion for them has ceased? ... Were the Realism of the human mind a transient phenomenon, ... then it might be supposed, that the *unsoundness of a metaphysical and logical theology* being once fully admitted, the *cumbrous machinery* might be removed, and the sacred truth allowed to stand forth to view, in its own attractive simplicity. But such a result seems rather to be wished and prayed for by a *sanguine* piety, than reckoned upon in the humbling calculations of human experience In the mean time it were well to retain, amid all its confessed imperfections, a system of technical theology, by which we are guarded, in some measure, from the exorbitance of religious enthusiasm."—p. 380.

"But this question resolves itself into a still higher one:—whether our Articles, *in the present state of Theological opinion*, ought to remain exactly what they are; or whether *improvements might not be made in them, commensurate with the advances made in other scientific methods.*"—Observ. p. 42.

"For though, I do not hold the Articles in the same estimation as some writers of the present day, nor impute the same benefits to their use, I am fully persuaded they have their use and importance. I think they may be *improved*, ... but I am far from thinking that they ought to be swept away."—Postscr. p. 13.

"To exclude theological opinion from religious profession, to endeavour to sweep away the accumulation of ages, would be but the vain attempt suddenly to change the face of the world. Our next best alternative is to modify it, to correct its improper application, and so to obviate its mischievous effects. In truth, I say, it ought not to exist. Theological opinion, as necessarily mixed up with speculative knowledge, ought not to be the bond of union of any Christian society, or a mark of discrimination between Christian and Christian."—Observ. p. 21, 22.

ARTICLES OF RELIGION.

Article I.[a]

[a] "The Scholastic Philosophy had for its basis a *theoretic* knowledge of the Divine Being .... as the Highest Cause of all things .... It was consistent, therefore, that theologians, the disciples of such a philosophy, should commence their ... Sums of Theology .... with expositions of those First Truths which immediately respect the Divine Being." [It is added in a note] "Thus, ... *in our own Articles*, the doctrines on this head occupy the *first* place." .... B. L. p. 99.

Of Faith[b] *in the Holy Trinity.*

[b] "Originating, however, in a combination of the judgments of ***speculative Reason*** with the prescriptions of ***Authority***, the system, at its maturity, exhibits in its internal structure, the result of that conflict of elements, out of which it had grown. Its principles, as I have said, were to be drawn from the nature of the Divine Being. .... But where was the evidence ..... of the truth of those principles? ... it was admitted that the nature of God, as He is in Himself, is incomprehensible by the human faculties. .... This difficulty might appear insuperable. But it was not so to the ***Schoolman*** versed in an ***eclectic philosophy***, in which the ***mysticism*** of ***Plato*** was blended with the ***analytical method*** of ***Aristotle***. The principle of ***Faith*** here answered the purpose of solving this speculative difficulty, as well as of securing the prescriptive right of Authority. Theology, then, as a natural knowledge, could not itself discover and establish the principles on which it reasoned. It might however receive those principles, through Faith, from an higher science, the science or knowledge of God." .... —p. 79, 80.

There is but one living and true God, without body, parts, or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness[c].

[c] "I venture to say, there are no propositions concerning God in Scripture, detached from some *event* of Divine Providence to which they refer, and on which they are founded..... When I say, therefore, that the Christian revelation is matter of *fact*, I intend by it to express my conviction, that the substance of the revelation is the doings and actions of God; I have always before my view some *event* in the history of God's *providences* to which I refer it. In this sense, the truth concerning God is independent of any particular *wording* of it—its proper divine character is exempted from all alloy which the *imperfection of the writer*, the peculiarity of his circumstances, or the *idiom of language*, may accidentally infuse into it."—Observ. p. 14, 15, (first ed.)

And in *Unity*[d] of this Godhead

[d] "No one can be more convinced than I am, that there is a real mystery of God revealed in the Christian dispensation.... But I am also as fully sensible, that there is a mystery attached to the subject which is not a mystery of God..... We are apt to conceive, that the *Unity* must be understood numerically; .... But is this a just notion?.... Surely the revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the *oneness* of the Deity, but *practically* (sic) to influence their minds in regard to superstitions from which they had been brought out.... Now were this view of the revelation of the Divine Unity strictly maintained,.... we should profess that we only knew God as *the exclusive object of Divine worship*, and should acknowledge that it was quite irrelevant to our scheme of religion, either to demonstrate, or to refute, any conclusion from the nature of *Unity* concerning any further revelation of the Divine Being."—p. 146, 7.

"..... the *dialectical* spirit .... laboured to establish the Divine *Unity* amidst the Trinitarian distinctions" ....—p. 128. "*Dialectical Science* .... established that peculiar phraseology, which we now use, in speaking of the Sacred Trinity, as *three Persons* and *one God*."—p. 130. "The *whole* discussion was *fundamentally dialectical*."—p. 104.

there be *three Persons*[e], of one sub-

[e] "The Latin ... had no other word ... but *Persona*: .... the term exposed him to a double inconvenience ... it was necessary

stance, power, and eternity,

to have recourse to the original *subtile speculation*, on which the Procession of the Divine Being was founded .... It was pointed out that ... in God ... there is no material individuation ... The *Persons* accordingly are *Three*, whilst the *Divinity* remains *One*."—p.132-135.

the Father, *the Son*, and *the Holy Ghost*[f].

[f] " The Son, ... the Logos, ... (in " the *theory* of Divine Procession,") is the principle of intelligence in the Divine Being .... The Holy Spirit is the Love of God towards his creation, regarded as it subsists in his own nature .... But why, it may be asked .... is the Word called *the Son*, and the Love of God called *the Spirit?* It is the resemblance &c.... In this speculation there is certainly a great deal of the language of Platonism. But .... the application of the theory is Aristotelic ... The orthodox *theory* of the Trinity. ... consisted in an *exact scientific view of the principle of Causation*. ... The heterodox in either extreme, whether those whose theories were *charged* with unitarian consequences, or those who *incurred the imputation* of tritheism, *failed in speculating* concerning the principle of Causation."—p.116-118.

" Notions of *materialism*, we may perceive, were mixed up with these several theories ... even in what was considered the orthodox view of the Divine Proceeding, *materialism* intruded itself" ...—p. 121-123.

" One fact is clear .... that there is some extraordinary communication concerning the Divine Being, in those Scriptural notices of God, which have called forth the curiosity of thinking men in all ages .... Let us hold that fast in its depth and breadth ... and we can neither be Sabellians, or Tritheists, or Socinians..... Historically regarded, they [Dr. H.'s discussions] evidence the reality of those sacred facts of Divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. But let us not identify this reality with the *theories* couched under a logical phraseology. *I* firmly and devoutly believe that word, which has declared the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But who can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject, on which our *technical* language is based?"—p.149, 50.

II. The Son [a],

[a] "But... why is *the Word* called *the Son?* ... It is the resemblance of the thought to the mind from which it proceeds, that gives the appropriateness of the term *Generation*.... In this speculation there is certainly a great deal of the language of Platonism.... But.... the application of the theory is Aristotelic, &c." ... p. 116, 7. (Vid. sup. on Art. I. note [f].) "Even in what was considered the orthodox theory of the Divine Proceeding, ... *materialism* intruded itself in the attempt to trace the order of derivation of the Son ... from the Father."—p. 123.

which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father [b],

[b] "It was attempted to be explained in what way the Son might be said to be generated of the Father, whether out of the *substance* of God,.... whether He is the Son of God by *nature*, ... or will, ... or adoption. The CONFUSION *of principles* of different sciences in these promiscuous inquiries is sufficiently apparent. But it was by such a philosophy, that the orthodox language was settled, declaring the Son '*begotten* before all worlds, of *one substance* (sic) with the Father.'" —p. 137.

took Man's nature [c] in the womb of the Blessed Virgin, of her substance,

[c] "In the *theory* of the Incarnation, our Lord is described as assuming to his Divinity not any human being in particular, but *manhood*, human *nature* itself."—p. 231.

so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, ... were joined together as one Person [d],

[d] "The account of the Incarnation itself was more peculiarly logical.... The orthodox maintained, that the notion of sameness here consisted in the *Personal individuality* of Christ,.... whereas the diversity was in the *two Natures*, the divine and the human, united in his Person..... And the excellence of the orthodox *theory* consisted in its reducing it (the definition of the whole nature of Christ) to perfect consistency with the *original theory of the Divine Procession.* It brought the inquirer back .... to acknowledge the simple Divine Personality of the Saviour, that he was the Word made flesh .... the more general language according to which our Lord was described as having two whole and perfect *Natures*, was *preferred* to the assertion of two *Substances* ... *Thus* we find the language of our Article affirming in Christ 'two whole and perfect natures,' 'never to be divided.'"—p. 137–141.

who truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, to reconcile his Father to us[e],

[e] "It is of little purpose to urge the *natural placability* of the Divine Being. . . . *God* no doubt is *abundantly placable*. . . . But the fact is, that *we* cannot be at peace without some consciousness of atonement made. . . . Turn over the records of human crime. . . . . All concur in shewing, that, whilst God is gracious and merciful . . . . *the human heart is inexorable against itself* . . . *it* cannot forgive *itself*. . . . This material and invincible difficulty of the case the Scripture Revelation has met by a parallel fact. It has said, ... that looking to ourselves, we cannot expect happiness; and, at the same time, has fixed our attention on a *Holy* One who *did no sin;* whose *perfect righteousness* it has *connected with* our unrighteousness, and whose *strength* it has brought to the evil of our weakness. Thus Christ is emphatically *said* to be our Atonement, *not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done*, but that *we may know* (sic) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that our *own hearts* (sic) may not condemn us . . . . 'If *our heart* condemn us not,' then may we 'have peace with God;' but without the thought of Christ, the heart that has any real sense of its condition, must sink under *its own condemnation*."— p. 251–253.

and to be a sacrifice[f]

[f] "The application of the term Punishment to the *sacrifice* of our Saviour, belongs to the same (Aristotelic) philosophy. It was contended, that an offence being an act of the will, must also be removed by the will; that whatever indulgence the will had allowed itself, the same ground must be recovered by *suffering;* that thus the equality of justice might be maintained. Hence it would be construed that the passion of our Lord, being accepted by God as the means of human salvation, must be a punishment sustained by Him, equivalent to the delinquency of sinful man. And this further accounts to us for the theological use of the word 'satisfaction *.' It declares the *sufferings* of Christ to be the voluntary payment, on his part, of what was otherwise not owing from Him, to the Divine Justice." . . . p. 250.

* Comp. Art. XXXI. "The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and *satisfaction* for all the *sins* of all the

world, both original and actual; and there is none other *satisfaction* for sin, but that alone."

COMMUNION OFFICE. . . "who made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and *satisfaction* for the sins of the whole world."

"The bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was, not that it exalted human agency too highly, but that in reality it depressed the power of *man* too low. It was no invigoration of the mind, no cheering of the heart to masculine exertion, in working out the great work of salvation, by exaggerated, yet noble, views of what *man* could accomplish. But it checked the aspirations both of the heart and of the intellect. . . . On the other hand, the true scriptural *practical* view of *Human Agency* is to be seen in the great truth of Atonement, simply believed and acted on, without the gloss of commentators, or the *refinements* of *theorists*. . . . . Take the truth simply, and what does it mean but that God is infinitely just and merciful, visiting iniquities to the third and fourth generation, and yet shewing mercy to thousands—that we cannot please Him by our works, or our sacrifices, or our prayers, but yet *we can do all things*, by Christ *strengthening us, working for us, offering Himself for us*, praying for us. The doctrine declares to us at once how much is out of our power, and yet how much is in our power. And by combining these two apparently contrary facts, in our scheme of *human agency*, it imparts to us the true secret of our Power against the temptations and dangers of the world. For let it be considered whether it is not precisely by such a combination of strength and weakness, that ability and success in worldly conduct are attained . . . . In every exercise of our minds, in every action or event, are we not conscious that much is left in our own power? Do we not see the fact strikingly displayed in the conduct of men whom we call great; whose greatness evidently consists in this, that, by dint of their intellect and moral energy, they bring the train of events into their own power, exercising an arbitrary influence over the voluntary actions of other men? But, again, on the other hand, do we not find, also, a stint and a bound put to this our intrinsic power? . . . Whoever . . . . duly acknowledges both these principles as the complex law of actions under both the spiritual and natural government of God—will at the same time see, that the truths of *human sinfulness*, of repentance, of *Atonement* and *Satisfaction made for sin*, are

only varied expressions of this great law; as being declarations of the weakness and the strength of man: *the union of strength* and *weakness* constituting his *real power* in the events of time—his *justification* in eternity."—p. 253-256.

not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men[f].

[f] "It is the same *philosophy* which has occasioned the distinction of Sin into Original and Actual; the term Actual expressing the *personal* development of that sin which is *conceived* antecedently to exist in the *common nature* of all men, and in each individual, consequently, as participating that common nature."—p. 233.

V. The Holy Ghost, proceeding[a]

[a] "The expression 'ex substantia Patris,' was appropriated (by the Schoolmen) to the Son; so that though the Holy Spirit was spoken of as *consubstantial with the Father and the Son*, it *was considered correct* to describe the Spirit, as of the substance of the Father, but only to apply to him the term *proceeding from* the Father."—p. 116. note.

"But why, it may be asked, is the one process called generation, the other simply *procession?* It is &c.... In this speculation there is certainly much of the language of Platonism," &c. (vid. sup. on Art. I. and II.)

from the Father and the Son, is of one substance[b],

[b] "Thus too they (the orthodox) *delighted to speak*... of the whole Trinity, as Consubstantial." (p. 127.) "It was an unity *both physical and logical* which the orthodox held; whereas the Sabellian taught only a *physical* unity, the Arian only a *logical*."—p. 126.

majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God[c].

[c] "There can be no rational doubt.... that the Holy Ghost came by Christ's promise to abide with his Church, miraculously assisting the Apostles ... and ever since that period, interceding with the hearts of believers.... Infinite *theories* may be raised upon them (these facts); but these theories, whether true or false, leave the facts where they were." p. 390.

VI. Holy Scripture containeth[a]

[a] "The Schoolmen had a high veneration for the text of Scripture; not inferior, I should say, to that of the most zealous Protestant. But it was an *improperly* directed veneration—a reception of the Scripture, not

simply as the living word of God, but as *containing* the sacred *propositions* of inspired wisdom. . . . . The subject and predicate of Scriptural propositions were examined in their respective force of signification, with the view of ascertaining the *nature* of the things described. This was done in subserviency to the statement of theological definition; to fix exact limits within which the Catholic *Faith* might be included. As heresies multiplied, more and more were such definitions required. . . . . And thus, out of simple declarations of Scripture, a mass of *theories* was constructed."—p. 91, 2.

all things necessary to salvation [b],

[b] "The disputes on these points (as to 'what doctrines are to be regarded *necessary*, and what may be variously held *without danger to salvation*') are remnants of the Scholastic spirit, which reduced all religion into *theoretic dogmas*."—p. 352.

so that whatsoever is not read therein [c],

[c] "Now the real state of the case in regard to our Scriptures is, that the whole revelation contained in them, so far as it is revelation, consists of *matter of fact*. Either we have direct and continuous history. . . . . or we have predictions. . . . . or . . . . reflection on the Divine agency in the world, and application of his providences." . . . Observ. p. 13, 14.

"Strictly to speak in the Scripture itself, there are no DOCTRINES. What we read there is *matter of fact*: either fact nakedly set forth as it occurred: or fact explained and elucidated by the light of inspiration cast upon it. It will be thought, perhaps, that the Apostolic Epistles are an exception to this observation. If any part of Scripture contains *doctrinal* statements, it will at any rate be supposed to be the epistolary. But even this part, if accurately considered, will not be found an exception. . . . . Let the experiment be fairly tried; let the inveterate idea that the Epistles are the doctrinal portion of Scripture, be for a while banished from the mind; and let them be read simply as the works of our Fathers in the Faith—of men who are commending us rather to the love of Christ, than opening our understanding to the mysteries of Divine knowledge: and after such an experiment,

let each decide for himself, whether the *practical* or the *theoretic* view of the Epistles is the correct one. For my part, I cannot doubt but that the decision will be in favour of the *practical* character of them. The speculating theologian will, perhaps, answer by adducing text after text from an Epistle, in which he will contend that some dogmatic truth, some theory, or system, or peculiar view of Divine truth is asserted. But 'what is the chaff to the wheat?' I appeal, from the logical criticism of the Apostle's words to their apostolical spirit, from Paul philosophizing to Paul preaching, and entreating, and persuading. And I ask, whether it is likely that an Apostle would have adopted the form of an epistolary communication for imparting mysterious propositions to disciples with whom he enjoyed the opportunity of personal intercourse; and to whom he had already 'declared the whole counsel of God;' whether, in preaching Christ, he would have used a method of communicating truth, which implies some scientific application of language, an analysis at least of propositions into their terms, in order to its being rightly understood? And I further request it may be considered, whether it was not by such a mode of inference from the Scripture-language, as would convert the Epistles into textual authorities on points of controversy, that the very system of the Scholastic theology was erected." —p. 374, 5.

"Some perhaps will say, 'an inspired writer has said thus, or thus—this then, as asserted by him, is matter of fact.' . . . . The expression 'matter of fact' will doubtless admit this sense. But to interpret the Scripture revelation in this manner, is only to return to the assertion of its dogmatic character under another form. It brings us back to take *the words or propositions written by the inspired writers* as the *substance* of the revelation, instead of looking to *the authenticated dealings of God in the world.*"—Observ. p. 14. (first ed.)

nor may be proved thereby[d], is not to be required of any

[d] "I shall only briefly touch here a *fundamental characteristic* of the Christian Scriptures, which *totally precludes all* deduction of

man that it should be believed as an article of the Faith,

speculative conclusions concerning religious truth. .... If .... we have no other information of divine things, but in the *facts* recorded in Scripture, a very important principle results .... and it is no other than what I have undertaken to establish, namely, that no speculative deductions from Scripture carry with them the force of divine truth. Pious opinions, indeed, we may form; it is hardly possible practically to avoid exercising the mind in reasoning and speculating on the given truths of Scripture. .... But pious opinions, it must be observed, are not parts of revelation: they must not .... challenge the zeal and devotion of the martyr to divine truth."—Observ. p. 13, 14.

"I do not mean that no right conclusions whatever result from truths of Scripture: but I confine the assertion to intellectual, or speculative, or theological truth, as distinct from moral. Moral arguments there are in abundance. Nor, again, have I any thought of excluding mere historical inferences—inferences such as would be drawn from any other authentic documents of history. It is, then, the intellectual, or speculative, or theological conclusions .... to which my objection applies. It is these which have been the fruitful source of controversy, and error, and heresy .... in the progress of Christianity."—Observ. p. 12, 13.

or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation[f].

[f] "What is it that we, who are members of the Church of England, are so zealous to maintain? we shall readily answer: It is the pure truth of God, as revealed in the Scriptures. Our 'hearts' desire' is, that not only ourselves, but every son of Adam may be '*saved*,' may be made wise *unto salvation* .... What then is the origin of all that variety of religious profession with which the world is distracted? ... Opinions on religious matters are regarded as identical with the objects of *faith*; ... we introduce *theories* of the Divine Being and attributes, *theories* of human nature and of the universe, principles drawn from the various branches of human philosophy, into the body itself of revealed wisdom. And we then proceed to contend for these unrevealed representations of the wisdom of God, as if it were that very wisdom as

it stands forth confessed in his own living oracles. . . . But it will be said, 'Are no conclusions from the sacred records to be drawn by human reason?' What then becomes of that rule of theological interpretation, that nothing is to be received as an article of faith, but what may be 'read' in Scripture, or 'may be proved thereby?' The latter part of this rule, it will be urged, is thus rendered thereby a dead letter . . . . I shall meet this objection . . . . and then proceed to establish the principle for which I contend—namely, that *no conclusions of human reasoning*, however correctly deduced, however logically sound, are properly religious truth—*are such as* strictly and *necessarily belong to human salvation* through Christ. . . . If we consider, then, the *true meaning* of the *theological maxim* referred to, . . . it is no decision of the question, whether reasoning is to be employed or not, in the establishment of doctrine. It merely directs us to go to Scripture for every matter of religious debate. If the alleged point cannot be proved out of Scripture, it is no truth of revelation. It by no means however follows, that what *can be proved* out of Scripture must *therefore* be truth of revelation."—Obs. p. 7—9.

In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those canonical Books of the Old and New Testament[g],

[g] "I would once more call attention to the *divine part* of Christianity, as entirely distinct from its episodic additions . . . . the FACTS of Christianity. These *facts* form *part* of the *great history of mankind:* and *we cannot deny them* without involving ourselves in *universal scepticism*."—p. 390. "When I say . . . that the Christian revelation is *matter of fact*, I intend by it to express my conviction, that the substance of the revelation is the *doings and actions of God*; I have always before my view some *event in the history of God's providences* to which I refer it. In this sense the truth concerning God is independent of any peculiar wording of it—its proper divine character is exempted from all alloy which *the imperfection of the writer*, the peculiarity of his circumstances, the idiom of his language, may accidentally infuse into it."—Observ. p. 14, 15. (first ed.)

of whose authority[h]

[h] "The regard paid by the Schoolmen to

was never any doubt in the Church.

the mystical treatises of the Celestial Hierarchy, &c. . . . shews that their system did not recoil even from the most extravagant mysticism of contemplation. Indeed no further proof of the fact is required than the commentaries *lavished* on the Book of Canticles at the different periods of Scholasticism." [In a note] "It is curious to find Jerome, in prescribing a course of education for the infant grand-daughter of Paula, recommending the study of the Canticles, as the ultimate point of her theological progress. . . . . Bernard has eighty-six sermons on the Canticles." . . .—p. 83, 4.

VII. The Old Testament is not contrary to the New, for both in the Old and New Testament [a]

[a] "When a Theology of this *à priori* character was established . . . . the voice of God was no longer heard, as it spoke 'in sundry times and in divers manners' to holy men of old; but simply as uttering the hallowed symbols of an oracular wisdom. The whole of Revelation was treated as *one* contemporaneous production, of which the several parts might be expounded, without reference to the circumstances in which each was delivered." —p. 88.

everlasting life is offered to mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator [b]

[b] "We trace . . . the same idea (the Judaic and Philosophical "notion" of justice) in some of the principal terms of Christianity . . . . as in the terms, *Mediator*, Advocate, &c."—p. 243, 4.

between God and man, being both God and Man [c].

[c] "Strictly to speak, in the Scripture itself there are no *doctrines*. What we read there is matter of fact." . . . (p. 374.) "There can be no rational doubt; that man is in a degraded disadvantageous condition; that Jesus Christ came into the world, in the mercy of God, to produce a restoration of man; that He brought *life* and immortality to light by His coming," . . . . Infinite *theories* may be raised upon them (the facts), but these theories, whether true or false, leave the facts where they were."—p. 390, 1.

Wherefore they are not to be heard which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises [d].

[d] "From the *scholastic* distinction between Implicit and Explicit Faith, we may trace the assertion, that the Fathers 'looked not for transitory promises,' &c. The *invariableness* and sameness of the object of Faith was thus maintained."—p. 239, note.

"If now we regard the Scriptures in the way of the Schoolmen, as having *God* for their proper subject, instead of reading them as a divine *history of man*, we naturally neglect the analogies of times and circumstances. The *immutability* of the Divine Being, in the contemplation of whom we are engaged, is the prevailing object of our enquiry. Distinctions of time lose all their importance in this point of view .... Our business is to collect into one theory every scattered intimation of the Divine Being and attributes. If on the contrary we take the nature and condition of *man* under Divine Providence as the great subject of our sacred Books, we are as naturally led to study the facts recorded in the Scripture in their real historical place .... Hence results an *historical* theology." .... p. 89, 90.

VIII. The Three Creeds, Nicene Creed [a], Athanasius's Creed,

[a] "If it be admitted that the notions on which their [the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds] several expressions are founded, are both *unphilosophical* and *unscriptural;* it must be remembered, that they do not impress those notions on the *faith* of the Christian, as matters of *affirmative belief.* They only use the terms of ancient theories of philosophy,—theories current in the Schools at the time when they were written,—to exclude others *more obviously* (sic) injurious to the simplicity of the Faith."—p. 378.

"It appears to me that its (the Athanasian Creed's) reception by us in its present form as the 'symbol' or 'faith' of Athanasius, is an evidence of the triumph of a party in the Church, thus declaring their authoritative judgment under the sanction of a name, which expressed in itself everything hostile to Arianism."—p. 105.

and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed [b], ought thoroughly to be received and believed,

[b] "The Apostles' Creed states nothing but *facts.* The transition is immense from this to the *scholastic* speculations involved in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. Both these last, indeed, are *logical definitions* of the high subject on which they treat, differing from each other only in point of comprehensiveness and exactness."—p. 544.

"The Apostles' Creed consists entirely of facts resting on testimony, which can be known no other way, but belief in the testimony ... Is there good *evidence* to the reality of the *facts*, or is there not? this is the

matter to be decided. The evidence of a parent, a friend, an instructor, is, so far as it goes, a real evidence to their reality. Our inquiries in after life only add to this evidence, do not alter its fundamental character." —Postscr. to Observ. p. 7-9.

for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture[c].

[c] "In this sense, texts, *as texts* (sic), prove nothing: texts establish Divine truths only as indices to real *facts* in the history of Divine providence."—Observ. p. 15. (first ed.)

"Let it be remarked, that all the theories proposed on this subject are Trinitarian *in principle* (sic). If the opinions of Praxeas, and Artemon, and Theodotus, of Paul of Samosata, Noetus, Sabellius, and others, amounted to Unitarianism, it was in the way of *consequence* or *inference* (sic) ..... We can *plainly* perceive, though *unfortunately but very slight memorials remain to us of their disquisitions*, that their anxiety was, to account for certain acknowledged facts of the Scripture narrative. .....

"One fact is clear through all this labyrinth of variation which theological creeds have exhibited; that there is some extraordinary communication concerning the Divine Being, in those Scriptural notices of God which have called forth the curiosity of thinking men in all ages. To *me* it matters little what opinion has been *prior*, has been advocated by the shrewdest wit or deepest learning, has been most popular, most extensive in its reception. All differences of this kind belong to the history of the human mind as much as to theology .... The only ancient, *only catholic truth**, is the Scriptural *fact*. Let us hold that fast in its depth and breadth .... Attempt to explain .... and the chance is, that, however we may disclaim the heterodoxy which lurks on every step of our path, we incur at least the scandal at the hands of others, whose piety, or prejudices, or acuteness may be offended by our words ... I should hope the discussions in which we have now been engaged, will leave this impression on the mind. Historically regarded,," &c.†

* Comp. Athanasian Creed, "The Catholic Faith is this ...."

† (Vid. sup. on Art. I. note f.) p. 148-50.

IX. Original sin[a]

[a] "They (the Scriptures) only so far gave the material of future speculation on the subject, as they asserted, that man came *perfect*

from the hands of the Creator, being formed in the Divine Image; and that his iniquity was a subsequent, acquired condition of being. The Schoolmen set themselves to explain both the *origin* and the perpetuity of the evil; adapting to this purpose the physical and ethical *theories* of Aristotle."—p. 219.

"It had been well if the orthodox had contented themselves with the *name* of Original Sin, to designate this moral *fact* (the *tendency* to sin existing in human nature); and whilst they disclaimed the Pelagian theory of Example or Imitation, as inadequate to the solution of the fact, themselves abstained from speculating concerning it. But disputation called upon them to define and pronounce. They thus essayed, what neither Scripture had authorized, nor human reason could reach;—to explain the mode of human corruption; to analyze, by language, the *thing* (sic) denoted by the *term* Original Sin, when the only subject before them was a general *fact*, requiring to be simply and clearly stated.

"The positive manner in which Augustine declares the transmission of the material element of corruption from Adam to the whole race of mankind laid the groundwork of the Scholastic discussions on the subject."—p. 224, 25.

"Our Church happily has avoided that *extreme* dogmatism on the subject, which the Scholastic philosophy instances; and which some of her own members would elicit from her language. We find indeed the *terms* of the Schools adopted in the Article on Original Sin, and a *train of thought* on the subject *following their speculations*. . . . It does not in fact define the nature of the thing, *though it appears to do so in terms:* it only lays down its effects, their depth, and their universal extent. It is impossible, at the same time, to deny that its language on the subject bears the *impress* of the Scholastic *theories*."—p. 228.

standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk [b],

[b] "Pelagius believed, as fully as his opponents, that mankind were in a worse state, in consequence of the first sin; but looking to the *moral* nature of man . . . . . he held that, as virtue was not born with us, so neither was vice. He contended, accordingly, for a *moral* influence of the prevarication of Adam on his

posterity; that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by *propagation* but by *example;* not because they who were propagated from him *drew* (sic) from him any vice, any fault; but because all that have afterwards sinned, have *imitated* him, the first sinner . . . Though the language of the Pelagians did not adequately express the inveteracy of that sinfulness of human nature, which Scripture and the world declare with one voice; *we must allow, I think, that their grounds were right,* so far as they attempted to give a *moral* account of the fact; and that *their opponents were wrong,* so far as they attempted to give a *physical* or *material* account of it."—p. 222, 223.

but it is the fault and corruption [c],

[c] "The adoption of this view (the philosophers' theory) of human nature by the Schools . . . . explains the word *Corruption,* in its application to the evil of our moral condition. It is a term of ancient philosophy" . . . p. 219. [In a note] "St. Paul's words in 1 Cor. xv. 36. are clearly founded on this *philosophical notion;* only to give a *rhetorical* point to his argument, he substitutes the word ἀποθάνῃ."—p. 220.

of the nature [d]

[d] "Original Sin, accordingly, is always defined by the Schoolmen in negative terms, as a want of original justice, 'carentia justitiæ originalis;' or an inordinateness of the desires; or, as in our 9th Article, a fault and depravation of nature, 'vitium ac depravatio naturæ.' The last indeed *is the most truly technical description of it;* expressing, accurately, the peculiarity of the *theory,* on which the doctrinal statement of Original Sin has been founded."—p. 220, 21.

"The disputes, indeed, between the Pelagians and the orthodox . . . . turn upon the point whether Sin is a quality of *nature,* or an accident of *persons.* The Pelagian account of human depravity clearly did not correspond with the doctrine of Grace connected with the Incarnation . . . . The Orthodox, on the other hand, clung to the term *nature,* as indispensable to the *theory* of Grace. They confessed, indeed, that sin originated in the will of man; for to

have denied this would have been to shake their whole *theory* of Divine Agency. But in order to secure, as it were, a raft on which the noxious contagion might float down the stream of human generation, they insisted on the term *Nature*, as the only proper designation of the moral fact."—p. 232, 3.

of every man [e],

[e] "This theory . . . . involved also other *theories* of the same Logical Philosophy. The *universality* of the principle was to be demonstrated."—p. 221.

that naturally is engendered [f] (*propagati*) of the offspring of Adam;

[f] "How could it apply, it would be argued, to the case of the infant soul . . . . ? The *theorist*, not content with referring to the Redeemer's love, as the simple earnest of the blessedness of the little innocent, sought how to connect this fact with the universal need of redemption. It was to be brought, therefore, under the theory of Original Sin. This occasioned the introduction of the term *propagation* into the account of the origin of evil. If the corruption of nature descended by 'propagation,' then would it exist even in the guileless infant. And the *theory*, as thus stated, would be the logical correspondent of the doctrine of Grace. If on the one hand all were under Grace; if it was God that worked all in all, on the other hand, all would be concluded under Sin. An universal cause, identical in all instances, would be exhibited on each side; a principle of life, and a principle of death, . . . communicating their nature to the multitude of individuals. The Pelagians, however, were not satisfied with this account of the matter. Admitting that evil existed in the world, and that the transgression of Adam had been injurious to his posterity, *they still denied its transmission in the way of an hereditary taint.*"—p. 221, 2.

whereby man is very far (*quam longissime*) gone from original righteousness [g],

[g] "Those expositors of her (the Church's) doctrine, who would draw from this Article a sentence of what is called the 'total corruption' of our nature, appear to me to take an improper advantage of those *theoretic* expressions." [In a note,] "The strength of the expressions ('*quam proxime*' [*longissime?*] and '*very far gone*') is to be estimated by

"This notion, partly *physical* and *logical*, is, the application of Aristotle's principles. . . . . It proceeds on the *assumption* that there is some *common Nature* in all things, that we designate material. . . . . *Hence*, evidently, the immortality and invariableness of the principle of *corruption;* the poison wears not out; the tyrant never dies; for it bears a charmed existence; amidst the fluctuations and revolutions of generations, it preserves its sullen stability and vigour. It is probable, then, that Pelagius and Celestius intended only to oppose this *material* theory; and to explain the fact of human sinfulness, as I have said, on *moral* grounds. In the fact itself, as appears, they did not differ from the orthodox: so far that they were acquitted of heresy, both at Rome, and at Jerusalem. But the *acute logic* of the African divines, traced their explanations to the consequences, and their *influence* was interposed to maintain the uniformity of doctrine in the Church."—p. 230.

X. The condition of Man[a] after the fall of Adam is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith, and calling upon God:

[a] "In pursuing the present subject, though we are immediately employed in considering the condition, sentiments, and actions of *man*, it is *Divine* Agency, we must observe, that we are tracing throughout; otherwise, we shall lose the real solution of the dogmatic language, on the several points . . . . For such, it should be remembered, is the nature of the Theology which has descended to us, as members of the Western Church. It is the Science of the Divine Being; . . . . All that we call *human* agency, is, in the expression of Scholasticism, the 'Highest Cause,' acting by 'secondary' causes . . . . This notion of the Divine Being was the very essence of Scholasticism—at once its theory and its practice. The Theology of the Schools, as the subtile instrument of a Theocratic Power, addressed itself to the study of the principles, by which it could command the elements of social order . . . . .Its ambition was, to place the first link of the golden chain, from which the heavens and the earth were hung, in the intellectual grasp of the ruler of the Church; from whom the subject-faithful should devoutly receive the law of action and belief."—p. 211, 12.

Wherefore we have no power[b] to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God,

[b] "We are inwardly sensible, at the moment when we will to do any thing, that *it is in our power to will* either *to do* or not to do it; that.... it is, in the strictest sense, competent to us *to will* (sic) to act in this way or in that way. And here resides *the true power*, the *proper freedom of the Will* in man".... (M. P. p. 79, 80.) "The passions felt, the sentiments formed, the disposition, the manners, manifest to each person's consciousness that he is truly an ἀρχὴ in himself; ... he finds that he has indeed a *power* given him by the Lord of all power and might, of which he could otherwise have had no conception. He perceives that *he is placed in his own hands*; that it is his high 'prerogative to be, in a great degree, a *creature of his own making*;' that *he can* modify and *transform himself*, as a *moral being, as he pleases*; that what he *may become* (sic) depends almost solely on what he *may will* (sic). Nothing, in fact, appears strictly placed in our own power, but our *virtue*, and our happiness as its consequent, on the one hand, our vice, with its consequent misery, on the other."—M.P. p. 84.

"In these inquiries, more than in any, is exemplified the maxim of the sage, 'that *human knowledge and power are coincident*.' We are engaged in exploring man's proper dominions, the region within which *man holds sway* with a *supremacy*, delegated indeed from the Sovereign Ruler of the universe, but *absolute*. The moral philosopher searches out that land in its length and breadth .... All our studies, accordingly, are subordinate to this great business—the *knowledge* of the principles by which man's activity develops itself; that by conforming to these we may obtain the mastery of ourselves .... To find out the laws by which a moral being is bound, is to *know where his strength lies*; to obey those laws, is to realize it in fact. All other Sciences only indirectly increase *man's power* .... Moral Philosophy *strengthens* and *augments that power* in itself."—M. P. p.86, 7.

"But if the Will, the active power of man, is in itself weak and inadequate to its own functions, it must be the part of sound philosophy to *strengthen* that *power* .... by immediate address to itself .... Such is the *high mission of Moral Philosophy*. Such is

the vast aim of all its subordinate and instrumental labours."—M. P. p. 91.

"But in working out this object, does it pretend to dispense with the service of Religion? .... No... A true Moral Philosophy will feel ... that the *pious assertion* of one, whose *moral strength* was perhaps never surpassed, is *literally true*, 'When I am weak, then am I strong.' For there is a real *enthusiasm* of the will, as there is a real enthusiasm of the intellect ... The fact is extremely difficult to be verified, as it appeals to each person's consciousness; it is difficult also to state it in an unobjectionable form. But it cannot, I think, be rejected from among the real phenomena of the mind. [Note, "See the Observations of M. Guizot .... Also, M. Cousin . ."] Moral Philosophy, accordingly, so far from excluding the operation of Religion on the heart, will especially respect Religion among *its* means of exalting and *improving* the *power* of man .... it will take care to preserve in its system and cherish that *instinct of our nature* which sends us for help and strength out of ourselves. It will breathe along with the devout aspirations of *faith*, and yield itself up to the holy violence of *prayer**." M. P. p. 92—95.

* Comp. Article. "he cannot turn and prepare himself by his own natural strength and good works to faith, and calling upon God."

without the grace of God [c]

[c] "The dogmatic manner in which we now speak of 'the grace of God,' placing it in contrast with the *powers* of *human* nature, or with nature in general, conveys the idea of something positive in God, something that admits of explanation as to what it is,—of definition, and distribution, into its various kinds."—p. 187.

by Christ (*gratia Dei quæ per Christum est*) preventing us (*præveniente*) that we may have a good will, and working with us[d], (*cooperante*)

[d] "We hear of grace *operating* and *cooperating*, grace *preventing* and *following*... But how *erroneous* is the conception produced in the mind by these several modes of speaking! When we try the notion of Grace by a survey of the Scripture-dispensations, what is it but a *general fact*, a summary designation of the

when we have that good will.

various instances of benevolent, pitiful condescension on the part of God to the wants and helplessness of man? It is thus that 'grace and truth' are said to come by Jesus Christ. The mission of Christ to the world was the strongest instance of the benevolent exertion of God for our good.... Again, we are desired to pray for 'grace,'—and 'grace' is said to be given to us. These last instances convey a dogmatic impression; but when we consider them more strictly, they resolve themselves into *concise modes of speaking*, adapted to the purpose of giving a distinct and striking view of *the fact*, to which reference is made..... It is then from *Scholasticism* that we have derived this *positive* sense. Those subdivisions .... of 'preventing' and 'following' grace, grace 'operating' and 'co-operating,' and others which our Church has not adopted, are expressly taken from the Scholastic Theology.... Grace is treated of in this system, as something 'infused' into the soul, by virtue of which the sinner is justified, and the operation of which on the heart it is endeavoured to trace through the stages of its process.

"The order of ideas pursued may be stated generally as the following. Grace is first communicated to the soul of man in baptism, ... as the seed of a new birth regenerating the soul. Hence is obtained the primary impulse, the original *motive* or efficient cause, by which the sinner is set on the course of the life eternal. This produces in him a *motion* towards God: in which state it is called 'a preventing' and an 'operating grace;' preventing, as it precedes all motion on the part of man;—operating, as it is the sole mover or *motive* principle ....

"In examining this account of the nature of Grace, whilst we fully acknowledge the *general truth* implied in it, that all our salvation is of the free gift and goodness of God; we may clearly perceive, that the *mode of thinking* is founded on principles of *ancient physical philosophy*, in which, accordingly, we must seek the account of our technical language on the subject of Divine Agency."—p. 187-191.

"Faith, being regarded as the infused principle of a new life, does not supersede the natural faculties of man. . . . The divine seed . . . . is a new *power* by which the subjugation of . . . the lusts of the flesh, is gradually accomplished. By faith in Christ, through baptism, being born of God, ... it is through the continual assistances of grace that, as we become *stronger* in the Lord, the offending Adam within us becomes weaker. . . . So far then from man's free will being impaired, by the divine life thus growing within us, under the blessing of Him who first gave it, our *free will* is in reality established. Our *condition*, antecedently to these influences, is one of *slavery*; we were sold under sin in bondage to the lusts of the flesh: we could not then do what we would, and we did what we would not. But having received the new creation in Christ, we commence the mastery of the rebellious passions; and so long as the spiritual life is cherished within us, our *power* daily increases. This then is the *Scholastic notion* of *free will*. . . . . When the *Schoolmen* assert, *in the language of our Article*, that we have no power without the grace of God preventing us, that we may have a will, and working with us when we have that will, they mean that we cannot be said to be free to will or to do what we design, so long as we are in the mere state of sons of Adam; that our real *power* is that command of the passions in obedience to the will of God, which the new life of Faith brings with it. . . . In the state of nature we are *powerless* . . . . under grace the means of victory are placed in our hands. It appears that *our Article* on Free Will *is framed with the same view*; I mean, that our proper responsibility as Christians *commences* at the time of our receiving Divine assistance. We are apt to suppose, that Free Will consists in the circumstance of *originating* our own purposes; it is here the actual *power*, viewed in itself, in the moment of exertion; the power shewn in doing what we wish, or of doing otherwise. . . . ."—p. 239-241. Comp. p. 198.

XI. We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit[a] of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,

[a] "Its original meaning (that of the word *merit*)... is to be sought in its connexion with the ancient *theories* of Justice. It is hence that it has been introduced into the account of Justification. . . . . The great Christian society was viewed by the *speculator*, in its relation to God as its Governor and Judge .... It began to be considered what man had done, or could do, in the way of claim on the Justice of God. Then the doctrine of Original Sin came into consideration on the one hand—that of the Incarnation and Righteousness of Christ on the other;—and the estimate of Merit was to be drawn from a comparison of what man now is, at once a fallen and a saved creature, with what he once was, when perfect from the hands of his Maker. From this comparison would result the conclusion, that man could have no *merit* whatever in the eye of God. . . . . He had only merited Punishment by his intrinsic delinquency. But in the righteousness of Christ a title to reward was found... Christ . . . . had earned a recompense for services given to God, without a previous debt of service unpaid." p. 245, 6.

Agreeably to this (Judaic "notion" of God "as a governor, dispensing rewards and punishments to men, as his subjects, according to the works performed in his service") Christ is 'the Lord our Righteousness,' or 'the Lord our Justice;' and the Apostle speaks of God having shown his *justice* in the act of *justifying* sinners through Christ. We trace, indeed, the same idea in some of the principal terms of Christianity, evidently drawn from legal or equitable proceedings in the dispensing of justice; as in the terms Mediator, Advocate, Intercessor, Justification, Remission, Pardon. It runs through the whole of St. Paul's exposition of the state of man under the Gospel." p. 243, 4.

by Faith[b],

[b] "To counteract that living death within us, a new life from God must be imparted. Hence that view of *Faith*, in the scholastic system, as an 'Infused principle.' 'As in Adam all die,' &c. All were corrupted in the flesh by Adam's transgression; all must be quickened by the *righteousness* of Christ. . . . . This inherent evil must be remedied by the

presence of some effectual antidote. Scripture fully revealed that antidote in the perfect righteousness of the Son of God. But how to apply that righteousness to the individual sinner . . . was the question. Here, too, Scripture provided an answer to the real difficulty. It has told us that 'by grace ye are saved through *Faith*, &c.' that those who '*believe*, and are baptized, shall be saved.' *Faith*, then, as emanating from the grace of God, and having for its principal object the righteousness of Christ, is the new principle of life in man. Baptism indeed is requisite as the 'sacrament of faith'—as the mystical act of the new birth; at once the visible and spiritual incorporation with Christ. But *Faith* must first come down from above to the soul, and turn it towards God *. It is the principle by which the life and immortality of the second Adam are generated in the soul. It is the grace of Christ, by which, antecedently to any acts of the Christian life, a spiritual power is given to the soul, and the heir of corruption becomes the child of God.

* Comp. CATECHISM. "Q. What is required of persons to be baptized? .... A. Repentance .... and *Faith*, whereby they stedfastly *believe* the promises of God made to them in that Sacrament."

OFFICE OF BAPTISM. "Dost thou *believe* . . . in God, &c. Wilt thou be baptized in this *faith?*"

"It is important to observe accurately this *physical notion* of Faith, as an *infused* principle, the origin of a new life; because it serves to account for the priority which is ascribed in such strong terms, in our Articles, among the acts of the Christian life .... Scripture, indeed, asserts the difficulty, the folly, the sinfulness of any endeavour to work out our own salvation on our own strength; and therefore lays such stress on the principle which sends us to the altar of the Cross. But not employing definitions in its delivery of divine truth, it avoids that *paradoxical* air, which appears in all systematic developments of the nature of Faith. There is one passage, in which it seems to give a *logical* account of Faith, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where Faith is described as 'the substance (*hypostasis*) of things hoped, the evidence (*elenchus*) of the things not seen.' But even here, when *the Apostle is speaking in the terms of a logical philosophy*, it is not speculative truth that he is engaged in treating, but *practical*. He is giving that idea of Faith, which may excite in his brethren a principle of conduct *, exceeding the narrow range of present things, and expanding itself to those

* Comp. v. 2. "Through *faith* we *understand*" &c.

v. 6. "He that cometh to God must *believe that he is*" . . .

nobler views opened by a revealed hope to the Christian eye."—p. 235-238.

and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine[c], . . .

[c] "Some judgment may be formed, from these considerations, to what extent the difficulties attending the notion of *Faith* . . . . may be attributed to the *abstract theories* preserved in the *technical language* of theology . . . there arising necessarily a stiffness and *positiveness* of doctrine, from the very nature of systematic statements. What strivings, indeed, and heartburnings would have been saved to the Christian world, had the proper *negative* notion of Faith been strictly guarded . . . . In this sense, Justification by Faith only is the sum of Christianity. View the truth in this broad historical form; and then, to add to the assertion of it the necessity of conditions, is to counteract the proper efficacy of Jesus Christ. But throw the Christian *fact* into the form of a *dogma*, and it is immediately acted on by the philosophy of *language*. It becomes matter of inquiry what Justification *is*, what Faith *is*; and distinctions are introduced, to obviate consequences from this or that statement. Hence, too, the importunate comparison between *Faith* and *Works* as to their relative importance."—p. 238, 9.

XII. Albeit that good Works which are the fruits of Faith[a],

[a] "Religion sums up all its *practical* energy in the one quality of Resignation. . . . It works on the heart by means which, in themselves, divert us from confidence in our own activity, and so far *check* that *activity*. . . . The conviction of a Supreme, all-pervading Being, who is the very energy by which we act . . . . is a thought . . . which steeps in self-forgetfulness all the faculties of the soul." (M. P. p. 96—99.) . . . . "A *belief of our Justification by faith*, separated from *natural* convictions of *duty*, rushes into the fearful extreme of antinomianism. . . . We may extend, indeed, to the feelings the observation which Bacon has so aptly made concerning the intellect; that they require 'not feathers, but rather lead and weights.' Religion gives them 'feathers;' from *Philosophy* they receive 'the lead and the weights.' Religion would at once bear us aloft to the Divine presence, and fulfil all the desires of the heart in the imme-

diate fruition of the chief good; *Philosophy* reminds us that we are on earth. . . . Observe then how the two principles combined work the good of man. As Christians, we look to God as our beginning and our end. He is our first mover in whatever we do that is good. The beauty, and the honour, and the happiness of our virtue are of him, creating us in Jesus Christ unto good works, and sanctifying us by the inspiration of his Spirit. . . . . In the thoughts, and feelings, and actions, connected with these holy *sentiments*, we find rest to our souls, and peace, and comfort, and joy, and animation. . . . But this is not all the development of man. There is a spirit of restlessness in our nature. We have springs of *action* . . Whilst therefore we . . . spiritualize and immortalize our nature to the utmost,—we must also *humanize* it; we must provide for the duties belonging to the heirs of flesh and blood."—M. P. p. 101-103.

"Holiness, separation from the world, devotion, stillness of the thoughts and the affections, are the means of religion: ethics are all *activity*, all business. Neither will answer the purpose of the other; both are indispensable to the perfection and happiness of human nature."—p. 301-303.

and follow after Justification[b], cannot put away our sins, nor endure the severity of God's judgment,

[b] "It is important to observe accurately this *physical* notion of Faith, as an infused principle, the *origin* of a new life; because it serves to account for that *priority*, (sic) which is ascribed in such strong terms in our Articles, to Faith, among the acts of the Christian life."—p. 236, 7.

yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out[c] necessarily

[c] "The intellectual and moral instincts of man were regarded by the School-Divines, as the materials on which the sacred elements of Divine Truth were to act, ... The truths of Revelation were to be steeped into the heart. . . . . It is, in fact . . . the Life of God in the soul of man that is presented to our notice."—(p. 263, 4) . . . "According to the Platonic doctrine, morality was based on immutable speculative principles, the abstract species . . . of every thing denominated good. His religion and his morality, ... coincided in the maxim, that the business of *man* was the imitation of *God*. Thus was the *confusion*

of ethical and theological truth begun in that method of philosophy, which first obtained the sanction of the Christian Church. The noble and seductive language of Plato, respecting the Chief *Good*, was too strong a temptation to be resisted by the ingenuity of the *philosophical* Christian, accustomed to the *theoretic* spirit of the ancient masters, and anxious for some, fixed, eternal ground, on which moral truth might be rested. The *metaphysical abstraction* of Plato was thus, with the universal assent of the Schools, embodied in the Christian truth of the living God; at once the object of devout contemplation, and the immutable principle of Ethical Inquiry."—p. 271, 2.

of a true and lively Faith [d],

[d] "*Morality*, then, . . . ascertains *all* those *principles* by which we are *actuated* . . . . it is only *results* of which Revelation informs us, the principles of our *moral* nature are the *motives*, the *only motives* to action . . . . But this *confusion* of *results* with the *motives* of conduct takes place, when the *religious principle* is substituted as the *spring of action*" . . . —p. 299, 301.

insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree discerned by the fruit [e].

[e] "The history of false religion and superstition shews abundantly that idolatrous, fanatical, and absurd doctrines, tend to ferociousness and profligous of manners. *So far* true religion is inseparably connected with pure morality. It is essentially distinguished from its opposite, or counterfeit, by those *good works* which are its proper *fruits*. But the case of a defective belief, or *misbelief*, of the truths of a real revelation, is very different from that of a creed fundamentally and totally erroneous. . . . . The truth is, pure morals neither *necessarily follow* in fact a pure *faith*, nor are exclusively the result of it. . . . . we cannot argue back from the conduct to the principles, ... as we could do, if there were an inseparable dependence of morality on religion."—M. P. p. 19-21.

XIII. Works done before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of his Spirit, are

[a] "Here also, as in the purely speculative part of their system, they (the Schools) united the precision and detail of Aristotle's ethical system with the fundamental doctrines of Plato. They have taken, that is, as their

not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of Faith.*

great principle, Plato's theological account of the Chief Good. It is established as their point of outset, that, as the inquiry is into the end of all *human actions*, the mind must first lay hold of that principle itself,—that great end or *Chief Good*. On the participation of this, must depend the *goodness* of all particular *actions*.... But to the Christian moralist, this Chief Good could be no other than God Himself, as revealed in the Scriptures. Indeed the Scriptures themselves *suggested*, in some passages, a view of God in accordance with this notion: as when the Psalmist says, 'Whom have I in heaven but thee?' &c. and in the passage which I have already read, 'There is none *good* but one, that is, God.' Whilst then the notion of God, as the Chief Good, had been originally received into the Church, independently of Aristotle's philosophy, the peculiar modification of that notion by the Schoolmen was obtained from the *physical theory* of Aristotle,.... that.... it was the pure principle of Excellence and Beauty that gave its perfection to each existing thing: at once the *motive principle*, and final cause, of all the *activity* of Nature.....

"The *theories* of Divine and *Human Agency* .... were applications of this Principle of Energy to the Divine dealings manifested in the salvation of man. It remained yet to develop its *workings* in the internal mechanism of man's moral nature; to illustrate here also, that *God* was *all in all;* realizing, by his vital operation, the harmony and perfection of the various powers of the soul.... Transfer this doctrine of the Philosopher to the Christian Schools, and you have the notion inculcated in the Ethics of the middle age, of the fundamental principle of morality. God is conceived to be the *moving* cause of all that effect, which the soul puts forth.... It is the operation of Divine Goodness which sets in *motion*, and carries forward and invigorates the soul, in order to its perfection of being. The coincidence of the ideas of *virtue* and *power* in their Ethical System is an illustration of this *notion*. For, according to such a philosophy of human *actions*, virtue would be that state of the soul.... in which there was... a vigorous and invariable *cooperation** with the Divine Energy—*a command*, or

* Comp. Art. X.

power, established by the higher principles of our nature, over the inferior animal propensities †."—p. 279-281.

† Comp. Art. IX.

in Jesus Christ [b],

[b] "This opinion of the dependence of moral theory on religious truth is, in fact, a remnant of the philosophy of the Middle Ages. Moral Science .... was absorbed in the vortex of Theology ... Its origin was traced, in common with that of all other truth, to the primary eternal Reasons subsisting in the Divine Intellect, the 'Ideas' of the Divine Mind; for thus it was thought that a stable basis was given to the distinctions of right and wrong." "But the Christian philosopher would at once substitute, as his Chief Good, the *God revealed in Jesus Christ:* and thus would be led to ... deduce his moral doctrines from the truths revealed in the Scriptures."—M. P. p. 23. 27.

neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-Authors say) deserve grace of congruity [c];

[c] "The expressions, *merit* of condignity, *merit of congruity*, if examined on this ground (that of the Scholastic theory), resolve themselves into less exceptionable modes of describing Human Agency in the work of Justification than they appear at first sight. With the practical evil of so characterizing any actions of man, I am not now concerned. But their *theoretic truth* is to be seen, in their *consistency* with the philosophical notion of merit, ... and the theological description of it as the effect of *cooperating grace*, ... Merit of congruity ... is the work of the Christian viewed relatively to the *mercy* of God."—p. 246, 7.

yea, rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed [d]

[d] "In Theology, human nature is regarded under a single point of view, that of its relation to the author of its existence .... Moral Philosophy, on the other hand, surveys human nature in its ... principles of *action* ... The theological principle ... the duty of conformity to the *Will of God*, is perfectly just and true in itself.... It must be admitted, that no *action* conformable to the will of God can, as such, in any case be productive of evil.... But .... the test of the *theory* is its adaptation to human nature. And its *erroneousness* is sufficiently shown by its tendency to *mislead* even the wish to *do good*.... Religion, in truth, begins where Morality

ends. Let each *action* be *done* as it is *morally* right. We are encouraged then to proceed, for *we are sure that it has the sanction of God* .... We know that God will ultimately reward it. Whatever may be its intrinsic imperfection, we rely on his mercy in Christ, and the grace of his Spirit, to give it a worth not its own, and *consecrate it to the doing of his Will**." p. 264-269.

* Compare Art. XVII. "And in our *doings*, that *will* of God is to be followed, which we have expressly declared unto us in the word of God."

and commanded[e] them to be done,

e "The source of that *confusion* of Theology and Morals which I have noticed, is to be traced back to the origin itself of Moral Truth: first of all, in its being handed down in the form of maxims and *proverbs* .... Moral truths thus rested, in the first instance, on *Authority* ..... Particularly when moral truths were conveyed amidst political regulations ...—as they are found in *the Pentateuch*, and in the extant Polities of early legislators or philosophers,—men would be induced to regard morality as a matter of *ordinance*."—p. 269, 270.

"But what contributed, perhaps, more than any thing to this confusion of Theology and Ethics, was the spiritual power which the Latin Church had been acquiring, more and more, over the consciences of men... A system of moral rules was required which should be in strict accordance with the *theocratic* principle, in which the power of the Clergy consisted. They must be such, whose lines should continually terminate in some *religious* object, and mingle the passiveness of the votary with the active obedience of the subject.... But the rules and sanctions of conscience, when thus applied, would evidently lose their nature, as simple *laws of morality*. Whatever validity they possessed, would result from the principle of spiritual subjection; from the notion, that they were *prescribed* by a Power which held the soul in its grasp.... The whole came to this, that Christian perfection was reduced to the *surrender of the will*."...—p. 275--277.

"The question of the nature of Moral Obligation, and the very use of the term obligation, are derived from this source (the Scholastic Philosophy). It is strictly connected with that view of Justification which I

endeavoured to explain in my last lecture. In consequence of Original Sin, man comes into the world a *debtor* to Divine Justice. He is under an obligation to punishment, on account of his *deficiency* from that form of Original Justice, in which he rendered to God all that service of love, which the great goodness of God demanded. Hence our terms *due* and *duty*, as employed to express right conduct. But the use of these words has created, at the same time, a *speculative difficulty*, which does not properly belong to the subject. Philosophers, we find, have been anxious to solve the question, why man is *obliged* to the performance of *right;* and have sought, accordingly, for some enforcement of virtue, beyond the simple fact that virtue is a perfect law in itself. *Religionists*, accordingly, have drawn down an *unnecessary* force from the law of God, considered as the rewarder and punisher in a future state . . . The truth is, that the term Obligation is a *religious* one; introduced into morality by that peculiar connexion which the *speculative* Theology of the Schools established between Religion and Morality. The Divine Law, the principle of the Divine Being Himself, was to be traced downwards in its operation on fallen man; and its powerful efficacy was to be asserted as well as its transcendent goodness, in the blessing, and in the vengeance* with which it was accompanied."—p. 296, 7.

* Comp. Art. XII. "Albeit that Good Works . . . . cannot . . . endure *the severity of God's judgment*, yet are they pleasing" &c.

"In carrying on our estimate of the effect of the Scholastic Philosophy . . . . we should bear in mind the view of human responsibility which is given under the analogies of Scripture. We are described as subjects *owing* certain duties of allegiance to a king . . . . as servants having certain *services* to *perform* for a master . . . . The principle throughout is, that our thoughts, our actions, our works, are *dues* (sic) that we *owe* to God; . . . . that we are under an *obligation* (sic) of *working* for Him who has bought us, redeeming us . . . . and now employing us in his own *service*. Judaism had already taught mankind to regard God as a Governor, dispensing rewards and punishments to men, as His *subjects*, according to the *works performed* in his *service;* as they kept, or broke, his *commandments*, statutes, and ordinances. To this

description of human agency, in relation to God, Christianity succeeded. A principle of *obligation* was adopted in the Gospel scheme, analogous to that of the Jewish .... The *service* of the Christian was *due*, because Christ had .... given them both liberty and life. Hence the language of that great Christian rule. 'When ye have *done* all those things which are *commanded* you, say, we are unprofitable *servants*, we have done that which was our *duty*—ὃ ὠφείλομεν—which was *owing* from us, to do*."—p. 241, 2.

* Comp. Art. XIV.

we doubt not that they have the nature of sin[h].

[f] "On this view of the case, (the *physical* notion of Faith,) it *appears* .... inconsequent and absurd to suppose that any Christian works can be performed without Faith, ... 'whatever is not of Faith' is then literally 'of sin.' It proceeds from .... 'the natural man.' .... Even works that might be called good, as they result from Nature, have then the nature of sin.... Scripture, indeed, asserts the difficulty, the folly, the sinfulness of any endeavour to work out our own salvation on our own strength; .... but not employing definitions .... it avoids that *paradoxical* air which appears in *all* systematical developments of the nature of Faith. .... Some judgment may be formed, from these considerations, to what extent the difficulties attending the notion of *Faith*, and of *Works done before Justification*, may be attributed to the abstract *theories* preserved in the technical language of Theology."—p. 237, 8.

"We should readily condemn the mathematician, who should expect a pupil to believe, on the ground of the mathematical skill of his tutor, that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles. .... Equally mistaken however is the theologian, who expects that the Christian hearer should admit, on the authority of the Church, the doctrine, that works done before justification 'have the nature of sin,' when that doctrine is established *by inference* from other admitted truths of theology."—Observ. p. 28.

XV. Christ, in the truth of our nature[a], was made like unto us in all things, sin only except, . . .

[a] "In the *tneory* of the Incarnation, our Lord is described as assuming to his Divinity, not any human being in particular, but manhood, *human nature,* itself. He was made 'man of the substance of his mother,' *yet without sin,*—without the corruption derived to all other sons of Adam, not conceived, as He was, by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit. Much subtile disquisition was employed to shew how the *nature* which He inherited from Adam was not corrupted." . . . . p. 231.

and sin, as St. John saith[b], was not in Him.

[b] "Texts, *as texts,* (sic) prove nothing: texts establish divine truths only as indices to real facts in the history of Divine Providence." Observ. p. 15. (first ed.)

But all we the rest, although baptized and born again in Christ[c], yet offend in many things.

[c] "To this purport were interpreted the words, being 'born in Christ,' . . . . *realism* representing each Christian as having a proper physical identity, in the unregenerate state, with Adam; in the *regenerate* with Christ. Such undoubtedly was the *Scholastic* notion."... p. 231, 2.

XVII. Predestination to life[a]

[a] "The *theory* of the Divine Predestination, on which *our doctrinal statement* is founded, is . . . a *theory* of God's mercy in Christ, deduced from its originating cause in the Being of God . . . . the exact accordance of our Articles on Predestination, with what appears the true Scholastic notion of the subject, is, to me, ample evidence that this notion was the doctrine designed. I am not prepared, at the same time, to vindicate those statements in their *theoretic* points, as the proper way in which the Divine Predestination and Grace should be apprehended by the Christian."—p. 199.

is the everlasting purpose of God,[b]...

[b] "If the Divine Predestination is stated strongly as the everlasting purpose of God, by which the soul of the sinner is freely justified; true as the *fact* is here *intended* to be described, yet, by inference from this assertion, we destroy the power of man in the work of his justification."—p. 209, 210.

Wherefore they which be endued

[c] "But the proper and full solution of the language adopted by Augustine, and after him by the School Divines, in the doctrines of

with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God's purpose, by his Spirit working in due season: .... they through grace obey the calling: ... they be made sons of God by adoption: they be made like the image of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God's mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity[c].

grace, is to be found in the *refined materialism* of the ancient *theological philosophy of Nature*. According to Aristotle, nature was in itself an instinctive principle of motion and rest. . . . But what was it that sustained this activity? . . . It was the great Principle of Beauty and Goodness the abstract perfection of the whole universe—the Chief Good—which animated . . . . each member in the system of nature. . . . This was a system of Theism, which trembled on the verge of Pantheism. . . . . But the adoption of Aristotle's system of nature in its more genuine principles, introduced a more express reference to the doctrine of Motion, in the language of the Schools, on the subject of Grace. The material analogies were then fully introduced, as a means of explaining those invisible motions which the *Spirit of God works* on the soul. In this system, neither was the Deity identified with the individual acted on, nor was the individual annihilated in the Deity. . . . . Still the notion of Him as an Energy—as a moving Power—entered into all their explanations of the Divine Influence in the soul. So far they were Aristotelic. But, with this exception, the Platonic notion of a *real participation* of Deity in the soul of man pervaded their speculations. . . . Plato's view . . . . was that of *assimilation*, or association with the Divinity. This notion more easily fell into the expressions of Scripture, which speaks of man as created in the *image* of God; of our future state as *like* that of the angels of God; and which holds out to us an *example* of Divine Holiness for our *imitation*."

"The *pantheistic* notion, then, of a participation of Deity, or an actual Deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the *operation* of *Grace* according to the Schoolmen. The *Aristotelic* idea of motion—of continual progress—of gradual attainment of the complete form of perfection—is the law by which this operation of grace is attempted to be explained. *Expressions of Scripture also coincided with this view*; so far as our state in this world is spoken of as a *going on* towards perfection—as a *growing in grace*; and we are exhorted to be *unmoveable, always abounding*

in the work of the Lord. [In a note, " 1 Cor. xv. ἱδραῖοι γίνεσθε, ἀμετακίνητοι,—agreeably to Aristotle's description of the virtuous character" . . . .] In fact, this system, made up of Platonic and Aristotelic views, was regarded as *sanctioned* by the Apostle, in his application of that text of philosophy; 'In Him we live and move and have our being.' The soul, *it was conceived*, might be transformed . . . . by the Spirit of God: it might assume the '*form* of godliness' without 'the *power*.' [In a note, " 2 Tim. iii. 5. ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἠρνημένοι. The notion of *Energy* may also be perceived in the language of St. Paul; as in Eph. iii. 20, 'the power that 'worketh in us,' τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ἡμῖν. Also Eph. i. 11. 'who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will.' . . . ."] But when the *work* of *grace* was complete in the soul, the form of godliness was the energy of power coming down from the Father of lights and Author of all goodness. Accordingly, by the Schoolmen, the natural powers of men are regarded as the materials on which the Divine Grace operates . . . . Still the notion throughout . . . was one of *material* impulse, of gradual progress and alteration, from a state of alienation to one of holiness and perfect conformity with God."—p. 192-198.

As the godly consideration of Predestination, &c. . . . so for curious and carnal persons, ... to have continually before their eyes the sentence of God's Predestination, is a most dangerous downfal[d] . . .

[d] 'The perception of such consequences acts on the mind of the framers of systems of theology; . . . . Such, however, was the mode in which the doctrines under consideration received their original form . . . . They excite in us the idea of accuracy of thought, of definiteness of conception; and we contemplate them with a fearful suspicion, lest we should err to the right hand, or to the left, in our mode of embracing them."—p. 210.

XVIII. They also are to be had accursed[a] that presume to say, ...

[a] " For if all *opinion, as such, is involuntary, in its nature*, it is only a *fallacy*, to invest dissent in religion with the awe of the objects about which it is conversant." " All that we ought to say of our own profession is, in the spirit of St. Paul's expression—Such is our 'judgment,' and we 'think also that' we 'have

the Spirit of God.' (Observ. p. 28.) "Thus to a Trinitarian, the consequences of rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity must consistently be regarded as dangerous. But he has no right to extend his *anathema* beyond himself, to one who has unhappily not embraced the same view of Scripture truth."—Observ. p. 27.

For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the Name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved [b].

[b] "The disputes on these points ('what doctrines are to be regarded necessary to be believed and professed, and what may be variously held without danger to *salvation*') are remnants of the Scholastic spirit, which reduced all religion into theoretic dogmas."—p. 352.

XX. The Church [a]

[a] "The *liberty of human reason* . . . formed the basis of the great spiritual Society. . . . The Church itself . . . had taught men to feel that there was a sentiment of personal *independence* which no external coercion could control. It was only an extension of this sentiment to the particular matters of religious belief, when men began to think for themselves, and to form parties within the Church. *Heresies within the Church* would present a refuge, *like* that which the Church at large had presented against the persecution of *tyranny* without in the civil world."—p. 33, 4.

hath authority [b]

[b] "I do not question the propriety of a *reasonable* deference to *the authority of the Church*. It is the *natural* support provided for the infancy or uncertainty of individual judgment. We *naturally* resort for advice and instruction to those, whom we think competent to assist us in our ignorance or doubts . . . . *Authority* is an auxiliary principle in learning; whether it be religion, or science, or any matter whatever of human knowledge that is concerned,—not a sole or fundamental one.

"We should readily condemn the mathematician, who should expect a pupil to believe, on the ground of the mathematical skill of his tutor, that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles . . . . Equally mis-

taken however is the theologian, who expects that the Christian hearer should admit, on the *authority of the Church*, the doctrine, that works done before justification 'have the nature of sin,' when that doctrine is established *by inference* from other admitted truths of theology. [Comp. sup. Art. XIII. note f.] I can understand very well the beginning and ending with the authority of Him, who is emphatically said to have 'taught as one having *authority*.' But the dogmas of Church communion partake as much of reason as of authority, and appeal accordingly, by their very nature, to the *reason* which is involved in them, *no less than to the authority* which pronounces them."—Observ. p. 37, 8.

"These, indeed, (the Thirty-nine Articles) may be signed by any one, who is *content* to do so, on *the authority of the Church;* either believing that the Church has a divine *right* so to define the Scripture truth, or on the ground that what is laid down by that *authority* is probably true. But the Church cannot be said to attest them; . . . they are not things to be reported by witnesses, like the facts recorded in the Creed. *These last the Church is competent to attest*. . . . But decisions of questions, arbitrations of doubts, rulings of points for prevention of disputes—who can bear testimony to these? The supposition itself isquite *absurd*."—Postscr. p. 8.

in controversies of faith[c] : . . .

[c] "Its spirit (that of the 'rule of theological interpretation[e]' contained in Art. 6.) is to guard the depository of sacred doctrine, the Scripture itself, against the inroads of tradition, or any human *authority*."—Obs. p. 9. . . . . "the principle of *Authority*. . . . artfully insinuated itself into the established Church system, maintaining the unity and infallibility of the Church, amidst its own unauthorized, adventurous theology."—p. 367, 8.

neither may it expound one place of Scripture that it be repugnant to another[d].

[d] "What was termed in the Schools the Analogy of Faith, was not, as may be supposed, an interpretation of passages relatively to particular periods and particular occasions, but merely the showing that '*the truth of one*

Scripture was not repugnant to the truth of another.' The Bible thus lost its most important characteristic in the comparison with other assumed revelations."—p. 88.

. . . . so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of salvation [e].

[e] Vid. sup. on Art. XVIII. note b.

XXV. Sacraments [a]

[a] "The word Sacrament . . . . by the usage of the Schools, was appropriated to those acts in particular, by which grace was conceived to be imparted to the soul, under outward and visible *signs*. The definition, indeed, given in the Catechism of the Church of England, is exactly what the Scholastic *theory* suggests: so far at least as the language of it characterizes the nature of a Sacrament. It is in the subsequent application of this definition, that the Church of England has modified and improved on the fundamental idea of the Scholastic doctrine; whilst the idea itself is preserved as being part of the very texture of technical theology."—p. 312, 13.

ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and effectual signs of grace and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him.[b]

[b] "As the Incarnation itself was an union of the Divine Word with human nature, so the Sacraments, *according to the theoretic view of the Scholastic philosophy*, were mystical unions of words with sensible things, by which the real Passion of Christ was both signified and applied to the soul of man—the visible channels, through which virtue was conveyed from Christ himself to his mystical body, the Church. . . . Theologians have not been content to rest on the simple fact of the Divine Ordinance, appointing certain external rites as essential parts of Divine Service on the part of man, available to the blessing of the receiver. But they have treated the Sacraments as effusions of the virtue of Christ, physically *quickening* and *strengthening* the soul, in a manner analogous to the invigoration of the body by *salutary* medicine."—p. 311, 12.

Those five commonly called Sacra-

[c] "It was, however, in just logical connexion with this theory, that the Latin theology de-

ments . . . . are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, ... have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper [c].

duced the seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome. They are applications of the Passion, or the Priesthood of Christ, ... to Christians, either individually, or as members of the Christian society. On the first ground, the rites of Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, obtain their sacramental nature; on the latter, the rites of Orders and Matrimony come into the same estimate. The great Christian community, both as a whole and in its parts, must be kept animate with the Divine Grace flowing from Christ its Head. Baptism confers the grace of Regeneration, the new spiritual life . . . Confirmation gives the increase of that life. By the Eucharist it is strengthened and vivified; by Penance, recruited from the effects of sin; Extreme Unction removes the last relics of the sinful nature, &c."—p. 313, 4.

In such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation [c].

[d] . . . . "in a manner analogous to the invigoration of the soul by *salutary* medicine." (vid. p. 312. sup. cit.)

XXVI... Neither is the effect of Christ's Ordinance taken away by their wickedness [a],

[a] "Hence...(from the Scholastic theory) the personal vice of the officiating minister could not impede the due consecration of the rite. The Church itself could not err . . . . Thus it was argued, the baptism of Judas was valid, *because* it was performed *with the authority of Christ*. . . . We are ready, indeed, *ourselves* to admit that the vice of the Minister does not impede the effect of the Sacrament. For it is *evident* that where the Faith of the *receiver* is *the true consecrating principle* . . . . the personal delinquency of *him who administers it cannot* deteriorate the Sacrament itself. There seems, indeed, scarcely sufficient reason for the introduction of an express Article on the subject, when it is once fully understood on Protestant grounds. We see, however, the occasion of it in the Scholastic theory of the Sacrament . . . . The importance attributed to the point by so distinct a notice of it, belongs to the recondite philosophy of sacramental influence. An authority and sanctity were to be maintained for the Church, as the sole and

certain instrument of sacramental grace, against all objection to the individual agents, to whose hands her rites should be intrusted. It was an admirable expedient, indeed, of ecclesiastical policy, thus to rest the power of the Church on the purity and indefectibility of an abstraction. Religious imagination was sustained on the picture of the Church, as the great Mother of the faithful, cherishing her beloved children in her pure bosom, whilst her many-handed agents in the world were securing their hold on the consciences of men by that prerogative of veneration which they enjoyed in her person. Realism here became an effectual means of power."—p. 323-25.

nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered by them; which be effectual, because of Christ's Institution and Promise[b], although they be ministered by evil men.

"The general belief in Magic, in the early ages of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory of sacramental influence. The maxim of Augustine, 'Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum,' appears to be in fact an adaptation of the popular belief respecting the power of incantations and charms, to the subject of religion. The miracles themselves, indeed, of our Saviour were supposed to act in this manner, even by those who did not impute them to the agency of evil. His *word*, or His touch, was sought for by persons acknowledging in faith the reality of his mission. . . . And our Saviour, whose condescension was shown even to the prejudices of his faithful followers, often accompanied the working of his miracles with significant actions. In the instance of the woman, indeed, thus suddenly cured, He is described as having perceived, that some one had touched Him, by the fact that *virtue* had gone out of Him;—a mode of speaking, characteristic of the prevalent idea, concerning the operation of Divine Influence, as of something passing from one body to another."—p. 315, 6.

XXVII. Baptism is . . . a sign of Regeneration[a]

[a] "But though we are free from the yoke which the Sacramental ritual imposes on members of the Roman communion, we still require watchfulness against the temptation to refine on this subject, and lest we enslave ourselves to a kind of *priestcraft* in our own minds. The tendency to raise questions about Baptism in

modern times, is an evidence of this spirit of refinement. Men are *not content* with the simple declarations; 'Repent and be baptized;' 'Except a man'... 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them'... nor will they acquiesce in the duty of conforming their practice to these Scriptural injunctions. But it is thought by some that the question must be decided, whether Baptism is in all cases equivalent to *Regeneration.* They propose a question, that is, as to the intrinsic *efficacy* of the rite;—a difficulty which practical Christianity by no means calls upon us to decide, and the decision of which, after all, can be only *speculation.* In regard, indeed, to both Sacraments, singleness of heart is the only human means that we possess of apprehending their true import."—p. 343, 4.

or new Birth [b],

[b] "The doctrine of Transmutation was a vital principle in Aristotle's Philosophy. According to this doctrine, any object in nature might be transmuted into another .... I allude to it now only for the sake of illustrating the notion, by which our Christian state under the influence of Grace is described. If .... the state of holiness and perfection to which the Gospel seeks to bring us, is a state for which we are not fit in our present condition, evidently we must undergo some *change,* .... The qualities then, to speak in terms of the ancient philosophy, of that *form* which we are to assume, must be brought to our present nature.... In a word, we must be *transformed.* The old things must *pass away,* and all must become *new.* We must .... be new creatures..... Christ must be '*formed*' in us." —p. 191, 2.

whereby as by an Instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church [c]: the promises of forgiveness of sins, and of our

[c] "We should observe the *confusion of ideas* prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism. *The Church* was considered as 'the body of Christ.' The Church also was considered as 'the Mother of the faithful.' Hence, being baptized, or being made a 'member of the body of Christ,' or being 'incorporated' into the Church, became equivalent expressions. Hence, too, the

adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed; Faith is confirmed and Grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

Church was said to 'generate' sons by Baptism."—p. 324, note.

XXVIII. The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign &c. . . . . a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death; insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ[a].

[a] "The opposition of controversy, whilst it led the orthodox to assert an actual presence of the incarnate Christ under the sacramental symbols of bread and wine, made them charge their adversaries with holding the Sacraments to be only *signs*. . . . And this may account for the pointed expression in our Article, that 'the Supper of the Lord is not only a *sign*' &c. . . . In denying an actual communication of Christ to the sacred emblems, it became necessary to guard against the construction of asserting a merely commemorative rite, and thus evacuating the Sacrament of its holy *burthen* of Grace. . . .

"The relative importance of the Eucharist in comparison with the other Sacraments, and indeed with the whole doctrine and ritual of Christianity in the system of the Church of Rome, may be drawn from this primary notion of sacramental *efficiency*. It may well be asked, why this sacred rite should stand so preeminent in the scheme of Christianity. I do not say that it ought not to hold a principal station among the observances of a holy life; but it is the doctrinal supremacy given to it to which I refer . . . .we may find an answer in the Scholastic theory . . . . this is the passion itself of Christ, the *whole virtue* of his priesthood mystically represented and conveyed. The priesthood of Christ comprehending in it the whole of Christianity, the rite by which that priesthood was especially signified would become the great act of human ministration, when the notion was once established of an *instrumental* causality attached to the use of the *sign*."—p. 319-321.

Transubstantiation .... overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament[b],

[b] "It remained then for later discussion, for the restless penetrating spirit of Scholasticism, to analyze, by the philosophical power of language, the operation of Grace in the Sacraments. The subtile speculations about *matter* and *form*..... were accordingly introduced to establish and perfect the theory of *instrumental efficiency* ascribed to the rites themselves."—(p. 331.) .... "Hence the use of the word Element ..... A certain matter and certain form are thus considered as *indispensable* to a Sacrament." [In a note,] "Hence the inquiries in our Baptismal Service, 'With what *matter* was this child baptized?' 'With what words was this child baptized?' 'Because some things,' it is said, '*essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted through haste."—(p.335,6.)... "The discussion of such points exactly suited the genius of the Scholastic Philosophy, and at length matured the theory of the Eucharist, as professed in the Latin Church under the name of Transubstantiation."—p. 338.

and hath given rise to many superstitions[c].

[c] "Had transubstantiation .... remained as a simple opinion, there might have been no harm in it. It is the enforcing it as a real fact of religion, as a primary indispensable truth concerning the mode of Christ's presence, that has thrown a just scandal on the tenet." —Observ. p. 15.

The Body of Christ is given[d], taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.

[d] "Here (in "the questionings of the Ninth century on the nature of Christ's presence in the Eucharist,") *the original Platonism of the Church* ruled the case. A *Real Presence* was asserted."(p. 72.) "Ratramn distinctly asserts a real presence, though he does not admit a presence of the crucified body of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine.... It is a real and true presence that he asserts; the virtue of Christ acting in the way of efficacious assistance to the receiver of the Sacrament. The Church of England doctrine of the Sacraments, it is well known, is founded on the views given by this author. Cranmer and Ridley &c."—p. 320.

It is right, in conclusion, to add the positive statements with which Dr. Hampden sums up his Bampton Lectures.

"But however successfully I may have established the desired conclusion; there may, I fear, remain in some minds,—where there has existed an indiscriminate veneration of the names and terms attached to Christianity, as of parts of the holy religion itself,—a painful impression of mistrust; . . . that, either the argument must be erroneous, or they have followed cunningle devised fables—the imaginations of the sophistical wisdom of this world—as the Gospel of Truth. For the sake of such persons, I would once more call attention to the *divine part* of Christianity, as entirely distinct from its *episodic additions.* Whatever may have been . . . the *speculations of false Philosophy* on the *facts* of Christianity; those *facts* themselves are not touched . . . These facts form part of the great History of mankind: they account for the present condition of things in the world; and we cannot deny them without involving ourselves in universal scepticism. There can be no rational doubt; that man is in a degraded, disadvantageous condition—that Jesus Christ came into the world in the mercy of God to produce a restoration of man,—that He brought Life and Immortality to light by his coming, that He died on the cross for our sins, and rose again for our justification,—that the Holy Ghost came by his promise to abide with his Church, miraculously assisting the Apostles in the first institution of it, and ever since that period, interceding with the hearts of believers. These, and other truths connected with them, are not collected merely from *texts* or *sentences* of Scripture; they are parts of its records. *Infinite theories* may be raised upon them; but these theories, whether true or false, leave the *facts* where they were. There is enough in them to warm and comfort the heart, though we had assurance of nothing more." p. 389-391.

Dr. Hampden distinctly disavows being a Socinian, and avows himself a believer in the Blessed Trinity, and it is our duty in his sense to believe him; but in this and other confessions of his faith, there is nothing to which even a Socinian might not, in his own sense, subscribe, while Dr. Hampden attacks those points in the Creed of the whole Christian Church, which are the especial stay against Socinianism. His theories are the parents of Socinianism: may God continue to preserve him from it.

THE PROPOSITIONS

ATTRIBUTED TO DR. HAMPDEN
BY PROFESSOR PUSEY

COMPARED WITH THE TEXT

OF THE

BAMPTON LECTURES.

IN A SERIES OF PARALLELS.

BY A RESIDENT MEMBER OF CONVOCATION.

LONDON: B. FELLOWES, LUDGATE-STREET.
OXFORD: D. A. TALBOYS.

M DCCC XXXVI.

PREFACE.

THE design of the following parallels was suggested to the compiler, by a passage in a preface to some propositions professedly extracted from Dr. Hampden's publications, in which Dr. Pusey has thus expressed himself.

"I have given a series of propositions, such as occur in the "following extracts, in some cases preserving his actual words, "in others, changing the grammatical construction only, so far "as was necessary in order to form them into propositions, or "supplying some words from the context, but keeping as far as "possible his own words, and rigidly attending to the scope of "the whole passage. Their correctness will appear to any one, "who shall examine the context as attentively. The state-"ments would have appeared much stronger, had I ventured "to translate them into popular language; but this would have "been to undertake the character of a Commentator more than "I wished, and might have seemed to be addressed to popular "feeling. I have, in consequence, upon some important sub-"jects, given propositions resembling each other, but each in "some degree tending to limit or mark out the meaning of the "other, leaving it to the reader to compare them, instead of "stating in my own words what seemed to me the unavoidable "result."

The terms of the above passage, combined with the fact, that these very propositions have been circulated throughout the country, under the authority of the Corpus declarationists, who have thus inadvertently rendered themselves responsible for their fairness, induced the compiler, originally for his own private satisfaction, to place in parallel columns the propositions, and the genuine unmutilated text of the Bampton Lectures. And the result has been to convince him, that, however innocently, Dr. Pusey, while "preserving Dr. Hampden's "actual words," has, almost uniformly, more or less, perverted their meaning, by the neglect of the context; "in changing

" the grammatical construction, in order to convert them into " propositions," has very frequently converted them into propositions, never contemplated by the author; and, however " rigidly attending to the whole scope of the passage," has failed to leave that impression, upon the mind of the reader which a perusal of the original work would have suggested; and finally, where " on some important subjects," he has given propositions closely resembling each other, " but each in some " degree tending to limit and mark out the other, leaving the " reader to compare them," he has, by confounding the order in which they appear in the Bampton Lectures, deprived his readers of the advantage which might have been derived from their being placed consecutively, so as in most instances to render them far worse than unintelligible[a]. These are the unfeigned convictions of the compiler; and he believes that, when the first heat of controversy shall have passed away, no one will more deeply deplore than Professor Pusey himself the injury he has been inflicting on Dr. Hampden, and through him on our Church, even though he should still retain, unmodified, that peculiar theory displayed in his preface, which so sufficiently accounts for his present estimate of the disqualifications of the Regius Professor, independently of what is not imputed, or even insinuated, the existence of personal feeling. Meanwhile, in compliance with the wishes of several friends, the compiler is tempted to place within the reach of Members of Convocation generally, that portion of his labours which affects the Bampton Lectures, not without a hope, that in the event of their substantiating the positions above laid down, they may be the means of inducing many conscientious persons to revise the judgment, which, under a jealous regard for purity of doctrine, they have, on the faith of partial statements, passed on Dr. Hampden; and of directing their attention to a work to which extracts even in defence must do partial injustice.

OXFORD,
Saturday, April 16*th.* 1836.

[a] Propositions 6, 10, "On Original Sin," and 8, 14, 23, etc. "Trinitarian Articles," exhibit painful instances of a carelessness and haste in drawing inferences in a matter in which the grave character of the charges involved should have produced the greatest circumspection.

[N. B. The numbers prefixed to the Propositions in the first columns denote the order in which they are arranged in Dr. PUSEY's Publication.]

PROPOSITIONS, &c.

TRINITARIAN ARTICLES.

PROPOSITIONS.	BAMPTON LECTURES.
1. Our Reformers, in giving the first place to the doctrines relating to the Trinity, were influenced by the discipline of the modern Church of Rome, whose bonds they had thrown off.—B. L. p. 99.	1. It was consistent therefore, that theologians, the disciples of the Scholastic Philosophy, should commence their Books of Sentences, their Sums of Theology, and their Commentaries, with expositions of those First Truths which immediately respect the Divine Being.—p. 99. *Note to p.* 99.—"The Fathers of the Church of England, *even in shaking off* the spiritual bonds of Rome, were [in the arrangement of the Articles i. e.] tacitly influenced by the discipline in which their minds had been trained."
2. Dialectical Science . . . . established that peculiar phraseology, which we now use in speaking of the Sacred Trinity, as *Three Persons and one God.*—p. 130.	2. The difficulty which the orthodox felt was, to avoid the distinguishing the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in such a way, as to represent them differing, as three angels, or three men, differ from each other; and yet to preserve the real distinctions. Dialectical Science furnished the expedients in this difficulty; and established that peculiar phraseology, etc. etc. —p. 130.
3. The whole discussion [on the Blessed Trinity] was fundamentally dialectic.—p. 104.	3. The profane familiarity, with which articles of the Trinitarian question are said to have entered into the every-day conversation of the times, characterizes the general feeling on the subject, at a period, when the Spiritual Polity formed the great commonwealth of the Roman world; and whilst Philosophy, regarded as identical with Theology, was essentially dialectical or colloquial. . . . . So great indeed were the impediments arising from the use of Terms, where the whole discussion was fundamentally dialectical, that the measure of accommodation between those who really agreed with each other, would probably have failed in any other hands than those of St. Athanasius.—p. 102, 104.

5. The reality of those sacred facts of Divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, is not to be identified with the theories couched under a logical phraseology [received in the Church.]—p. 150.

4. No one can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject, on which our technical language is based. —p. 150.

5. 4. Let us hold fast the Scriptural fact in the depth and breadth—in nothing extenuating, in nothing abridging it—in simplicity and sincerity; and we can neither be Sabellians, or Tritheists, or Socinians. Attempt to explain and to reconcile difficulties, and however we may disclaim the heterodoxy which lurks in our path, we incur, at least, scandal at the hands of others, whose piety, or prejudice, or acuteness, are offended by our words. I should hope the discussions in which we have now been engaged, will leave this impression on the mind. Historically regarded, they evidence the reality of those sacred facts of divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. But let us not identify this reality with the theories couched under a logical phraseology. I firmly and devoutly believe that word, which hath declared the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. But who can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject, on which our technical language is based? I would say with St. Augustine, looking to the simple truth of Scripture, "Hæc scio. Distinguere autem inter illam Generationem et hanc Processionem, nescio, non valeo, non sufficio.—Verius enim cogitatur Deus, quam dicitur; et verius *est*, quam cogitatur—p. 150.

8. All the ancient heresies were Trinitarian in principle.—p. 148.

8. Let it then be remarked, that all the theories proposed on the subject are Trinitarian *in principle*. If the opinions of Praxeas, and Artemon, and Theodotus, of Paul of Samosata, Sabellius, and others, amounted to Unitarianism, it was in the way of *consequence*, or *inference*. They set out with a Trinitarian hypothesis, and explained it away themselves by their speculations. . . . Take the reverse of the case, and you will judge, what a difference would have been in the language of these theorists. We should have had no attempts to explain the Divine Unity consistently with Trinitarian distinctions.—p. 148.

11. The only Catholic truth is the Scriptural fact, [i. e. the events of Divine Providence related in Scripture.]—p. 149.

11. 10. 9. To me it matters little, what opinion on the subject has been advocated by the shrewdest wit or deepest learning, has been most popular, or most extensive in its reception. All differences of this kind [not surely differences of opinion] relate to the history of the human mind as much as to theology. . . .

10. It matters little, which opinion has been prior, has been advocated with the shrewdest wit, or deepest learning, has been most popular, most extensively received.—Ib.

9. All the differences [of opinion] which have ever prevailed upon the doctrine of the Trinity, relate to the history of the human mind as much as to theology: and do not affect the Catholic faith.—Ib.

The only Catholic truth is the Scriptural fact. Let us hold fast the Scriptural fact in its depth and breadth—in nothing extenuating, in nothing abridging it—and we can neither be Sabellians, nor Tritheists, nor Socinians.—p. 149.

14. The Revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the *oneness* of the Deity.—p. 147.

15. It was merely a denial of polytheism, but no revelation of Almighty God as numerically one.—p. 146, 7.

14. 15. Take, for instance, the notion of the Divine Unity. We are apt to concieve that the Unity must be understood numerically; that we may reason from the notion of Unity, to the properties of the Divine Being. But is this a just notion of the Unity of God? Is not the Unity of God rather a limit of speculation, than a point of outset? For how was it revealed in that system, in which it was the great leading article of divine instruction? When Moses called upon the people, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord," was it not a declaration that Jehovah is not that host of heaven, which heathen idolatry had enshrined, but the God in heaven, in earth, in the sea—not the Teraphim of domestic worship, but the Universal Governor. Surely the revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity; but, *practically*, to influence their minds in regard to the superstitions from which they had been brought out. It was no other than the command; "Thou shalt have no other Gods but me."

Now, were this view of the Revelation of the Divine Unity strictly maintained, would it not greatly abate the repugnance often felt at the admission of a Trinity in Unity?—p. 146, 7.

16. Materialism intruded itself into what was considered the orthodox view of the Divine Proceeding.
—p. 122.

16. Notions of materialism were mixed up with these several theories of Causation (the Arian, the Sabellian, etc.). . . . Even in what was considered the orthodox doctrine of the Divine Proceeding, materialism intruded itself, in the attempt to trace the order of derivation of the Son and Holy Spirit from the Father. "Ex ore altissimi prodii; Eructavit cor meum verbum bonum; Ego ex Patre processi;" were argued from, *as proofs* that the Son was of the *same* substance with the Father.—p. 122.

17. There is much of the language of Platonism in the speculation on the generation of the Son, and the Procession of the Holy Spirit.
—p. 117.

12. The orthodox *theory* of the Trinity . . . . consisted in an *exact scientific view of the principle of Causation.*—p. 118.

17. 12. In this speculation there is certainly a great deal of the language of Platonism. In the *Timæus*, we find the term μονογενής, the unigenitus of the Latin Fathers, more than once applied to the Universe, the secondary Divine being of the Platonic system, etc. etc. The Schoolmen (however) considered the Being of God, not only with the eye of Platonic mysticism, but further (with Aristotle) as the principle of *efficiency*, etc. The orthodox theory of the Trinity, accordingly, consisted in an exact scientific view of the theory of Causation;—the heterodox, whether unitarian or tritheist, failed in this speculation.—p. 117, 118.

19. The account of the Incarnation itself was more peculiarly logical; still there was a mixture of physical speculation.
—p. 137.

18. The orthodox language, declaring the Son "*begotten* before all worlds, *of one substance* (sic) with the Father," was settled by a philosophy, wherein the principles of different sciences were confounded.
—p. 137.

19. 18. The *discussions* on the Incarnation were, in like manner, partly logical, partly physical. It was attempted to be explained, in what way the Son might be said to be generated of the Father; whether out of the substance of God, or out of a common Divinity, of which each participates; or by division of the Paternal substance, as a portion severed, etc. etc. The confusion of principles of different sciences in these promiscuous inquiries, is sufficiently apparent. But it was by such a philosophy that the orthodox language was settled, declaring the Son, "begotten, before all worlds, of *one substance* with the Father."
—p. 137.

20. The excellence of the orthodox theory [of the union of the two natures in Christ,] consisted in reducing the definition to perfect consistency with the *original theory of the Divine Procession.* —p. 139.

20. The Nestorians offended, etc.; in stating *two different hypostases*, and destroyed also the personal individuality. The Eutychian maintained the personal individuality, but destroyed the substantial differences. Theories of the composition and mixture of bodies, entered largely into these discussions, etc. The excellency of the orthodox theory, consisted, in its excluding from that definition, all ideas imported from the physical speculations, and reducing it to perfect consistency with the original theory of the Divine Procession. It brought the inquirer back to the acknowledgment of the simple Divine Personality of the Saviour as "the Word made flesh."—p. 139.

21. The divine part of Christianity is its facts; the received statements of doctrines are only episodic additions, some out of infinite theories which may be raised on the texts of Scripture.—p. 390.

21. It must, I think, be on the whole admitted, that the Force of Theory has been very considerable in modifying our Theological language. And I would submit to your reflection, whether that force has been sufficiently allowed for, either in our general profession of Christianity, or in our controversies on particular articles of Doctrines?

But, however successfully I may have established the desired conclusion; there may, I fear, remain in some minds,—where there has existed an indiscriminate veneration of the names and terms attached to Christianity, as of parts of the holy religion itself,—a feeling of mistrust and suspicion. For the sake of such persons, I would once more call attention to the divine part of Christianity, as entirely distinct from its episodic additions.—p. 389, 390.

Thus the facts of our religion, such as the degeneracy of man—the coming of Christ Jesus in the mercy of God—his bringing life and immortality to light—his dying on the Cross for our sins—his rising again for our justification—the coming of the Holy Ghost, and other truths connected with these—are not collected merely from *texts* or *sentences* of Scripture: they are parts of its records. Infinite theories may be raised upon them; but these theories, whether true or false, leave the facts where they were. There is enough in them to warm and comfort the heart; though we had assurance of nothing more.—p. 390, 391.

22. The application of the term punishment to the

22. The application of the term *Punishment* to the sacrifice of our Saviour, belongs to the same philosophy [as that which explained the

sacrifice of our Saviour belongs to the Aristotelic philosophy.—p. 250.

subject of repentance from Aristotle's theory of Commutative justice]. Hence it would be construed, that the passion of our Lord, being accepted by God as a means of human salvation, must be a *punishment* sustained by Him, equivalent to the delinquency of sinful man.—p. 250.

23. The bane of this *philosophy of expiation* was, that it depressed the power of *man* too low.—p. 253.

23. To the reduction of the subject [of repentance] under the head of Penal Justice, may be ascribed, in great measure, the unholy practices which grew up in the [Romish] Church, in regard to the expiation of offences, and their respective criminalty. Thus the subject of Repentance, instead of being placed by the side of Faith, is passed over *as a doctrine* of the Gospel, with slight notice. But, as *a Sacrament*, and a ritual of punishment [under the term *penance*], it obtains a full consideration.—p. 249.

The bane of this philosophy of expiation was, not that it exalted human agency too highly, but that in reality it depressed the power of man too low. It was no invigoration of the mind, no cheering of the heart in working out the great work of salvation. . . . It brought men to acquiesce in a confession of impotence, without carrying them at once to the throne of Grace. The ecclesiastical power stood between the heart and heaven. Atonement was converted into a theory of Commutation degrading to the holiness of God, while it spoke the peace of God in terms of flattering delusion to the sinner. The value of confessions and rites of penance was acknowledged; and, accepting this vain substitute for that assurance of Atonement, which alone can satisfy the longing soul with goodness, men's proper power was exchanged for a servile dependence on the ministrations of the priest—the presumed all-sufficiency of a man like themselves.—p. 253.

25. 'Atonement' in its true practical sense expresses the fact, that *we* cannot be at peace, without some consciousness of Atonement made, not that God may forgive us, but that we may forgive ourselves.—p. 252.

25. The heart seeks for reparation and satisfaction: its longings are, that its sins be no more remembered, that the characters in which they are written may be blotted out. Hence the congeniality to its feelings of the notion of Atonement. It is no speculative thought, etc. . . . . But the fact is, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of Atonement made. The word Atonement, in its true, practical sense, expresses this indisputable fact. All the records of human crime, concur in shewing, that, whilst God is gracious and merci-

ful, repenting Him of the evil, the human heart is inexorable against itself. It may hope—tremblingly hope—that God will forgive it, but it cannot forgive itself.—p. 252.

24. Christ is emphatically *said* to be our Atonement, not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that *we may know* (sic) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him* (sic).—Ib.

24. Scripture hath said, we have no hope in ourselves; and, at the same time, has fixed our attention on a Holy One who did no sin; whose perfect righteousness it has connected with our unrighteousness, and whose strength it has brought to the evil of our weakness. Thus Christ is emphatically said to be our Atonement; not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done; but that *we may know*, that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that *our own hearts* may not condemn us. Without the thought of Christ, the heart, that has any real sense of its condition, must sink under its own condemnation.—p. 252, 3.

26. The true Scriptural practical view of *Human Agency* is to be seen in the great truth of Atonement, simply believed and acted on, without the gloss of commentators, or the *refinement* of *theorists*.—p. 254.

28. The *simple* meaning of the Atonement is, that God is infinitely just and merciful, that we cannot please him by our works, or our sacrifices, or our prayers, but yet *we* can do all things, by Christ strengthening us, working for us, offering himself for us, praying for us.—Ib.

26. 28. 27. The true Scriptural practical view of Human Agency [in contradistinction to the doctrine of penance, etc.; see No. 23.], on the other hand, is to be seen in the great doctrine of Atonement, simply believed and acted upon, without the gloss of commentators, or refinements of theorists [who had degraded it into a theory of commutation, etc. see No. 23.]. These are but attempts to weigh the ocean in the hollow of the hand. Take the truth simply, and what does it mean but that God is infinitely just and merciful—that we cannot please Him by our works, or our sacrifices, or our prayers, but yet we can do all things, by Christ strengthening us, working for us, offering Himself for us, praying for us. The doctrine declares to us that much is out of our power, and yet how much is in our power. And, by combining these two apparently contrary facts in one scheme of human agency, it imparts to us the true secret of our Power against the temptations and dangers of the world. . . . Whoever duly estimates these things, will see that Scripture enforces on us no strange thing, when it tells us, that "our sufficiency is of God;" and again, that he who "doeth the will of God, is accepted by him." But, whoever acknowledges both these principles as the complex Law of Actions under both the Spiritual and natural government of God—will, at the same time, see that the truths of human sinfulness,

27. The truths of human sinfulness, of repentance, of atonement, and satisfaction made for sin, are only varied expressions of the great law, that much is in our power, and much out of it.—p. 254-6.

of Repentance, of Atonement and Satisfaction for sin, are only varied expressions of this great law:—this union of strength and weakness, constituting man's real power in the events of time—his justification in eternity.—p. 254–6.

30. Our Saviour, in accompanying his miracles with significant actions, *condescended* to the prejudices of His followers, who believed that His word, or His touch, acted after the manner of secret agents in nature.—314, 5.

29. Our Saviour's mode of speaking, that *virtue* had gone out of him, is characteristic of *the prevalent idea*, concerning the operation of Divine influence, as of something passing from one body to another. —p. 315.

30. 29. The general belief in Magic, in the early history of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory [as the Scholastic] of Sacramental influence. The maxim of St. Augustine, "Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum," appears to be, in fact, an adaptation of the popular belief respecting the power of incantations and charms, to the subject of Religion. The miracles themselves, indeed, of our Saviour, were supposed to act in this manner, even by such as did not attribute them to the agency of evil spirits. The woman, who forced her way through the crowd, fully trusted that she should be made whole, if she could *touch* but the hem of the garment of Jesus. And our Saviour, whose condescension was shewn even to the prejudices of his faithful followers, often accompanied the working of his miracles with significant actions. In the instance of the woman, indeed, thus suddenly cured, He is described as having perceived that some one had touched Him, by the fact, that *virtue* had gone out of Him;—a mode of speaking characteristic of the prevalent idea concerning the operation of Divine Influence, as of something passing from one body to another.—p. 315, 16.

HOLY SCRIPTURE.

14. No further proof of the extravagant mysticism of the Schoolmen is required, than the commentaries *lavished* on the Book of Canticles at the

14. The regard paid by the Schoolmen to the mystical treatises of "The Celestial Hierarchy," and "The Divine Names,"—works, composed probably in the Vth century, but, in the fashion of the age, ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, shews that their system did not recoil even from the most extravagant mysticism of contemplation. Indeed no further

different periods of Scholasticism. —p. 84.

proof is required, than the commentaries lavished on the Book of Canticles, at the different periods of Scholasticism. Still, as might be expected, the practical character of them is the more apparent, etc.—p. 83, 84.

Note to p. 84.—Bernard has eighty-six Sermons on the Canticles, and these only parts of an unfinished work.

2. We are not to regard the Scriptures, as having God for their proper subject, but as a divine history of man.—p. 89.

3. To make it our business, to collect into one theory every scattered intimation of the Divine Being and attributes, is a result of this false view. —p. 89.

2. 3. If now we regard the Scriptures, as having *God* for their proper subject, instead of reading them as a divine history of man, we naturally neglect the analogies of times and circumstances. The immutability of the Divine Being, in the contemplation of whom we are *then* exclusively engaged, is the prevailing object of our inquiry. *Distinctions of time* lose all their importance in this point of view. Our business is, to collect into one theory every scattered intimation of the Divine being and attributes. If on the contrary we take the nature and condition *of man under Divine Providence*, as the great subject of the sacred Books, we are as naturally led to study the facts recorded in the Scripture *in their real historical place*. Hence results . . . a register as it were of the religious conduct of man under the government of God; and consequently principles of the Divine Character and Government applicable to the future direction of our lives. Such however was not the method of the Schoolmen. They inverted the process, and *commenced* with those notions [of the Divine Nature and Attributes] with which they should have *ended* the inquiry.—p. 89. 90.

6. A reception of the Scripture, not simply as the living word of God, but as *containing* the sacred *propositions* of inspired wisdom, is an improperly directed veneration. —p. 91.

6. I feel convinced that, were due weight given to it, [the manner in which Scripture appeals to the heart and feelings, i. e. the rhetorical nature of the Scriptures,] it would tend more than any thing else, to dissipate the wild theories of speculative religionists, and bring men to the true way of finding out God in the Scriptures. At present however I allude to it, as the neglect of it was involved in the Scholastic Theology. The Schoolmen had a high veneration for the *text* of Scripture—not inferior, I should say, to that of the most zealous Protestant. But it was an improperly-directed veneration—a reception of the Scripture, not simply as the living word of God, but as containing the sacred *propositions* (sic) of inspired wisdom. We know to what scrupulous nicety

the Jews carried their glosses of the older Scriptures. Theirs was a respect simply for the *words* of God; not incompatible, as experience proved, with an actual nullification of the *Divine Word* itself. Like the Scribes, thus did the theologians of the Schools, with dutiful officiousness, gather up the fragments of revealed truth; but, in the mean-time, they lost the opportunity of feeding on the bread of God which came down from heaven. Their piety became a superstition, transubstantiating the truth of God into the verbal elements by which it was signified.—p. 91. 92.

13. A participation of Deity, or an actual deification of our nature, is the fundamental idea of the *operation* of *grace*, according to the Schoolmen, and is a pantheistic notion. (Comp. Θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως. 2 Pet. i. 4.)—p. 197.

13. The pantheistic notion of a participation of Deity, or *an actual* Deification of our nature, (*Aquinas* Prima IIdæ, qu. CXII. art. I.) is the fundamental idea of the operation of Grace according to the Schoolmen. . . . . This system, made up of Platonic and Aristotelic views, was regarded as sanctioned by the Apostle, in his application of the text of philosophy: "In him we live, and move, and have our being."—p. 197.

The proper way in which Grace should be apprehended by the Christian, it cannot too often be repeated, is not by theoretic statement. It is a truth which concerns more the heart than the intellect; and, in defining which accordingly, every attempt, however exactly and piously worded, must fail; much more, any theory of it drawn from antecedent speculations on the Nature of God. . . . . To define accurately the nature of Grace, is the work of a Christian life; it is a process of induction which can only be carried on, where there is a disposition and an activity, in doing the Divine Will, and obeying the Divine Motions. Otherwise we are but tracking the arrow through the air, or the keel of the vessel through pathless waters.—p. 199. 200.

The whole philosophy of the Schools on the subject of the Divine Agency, be it remembered, *is founded on an application of processes in the mind to processes in nature.* I wish it then to be considered, whether our difficulties may not be ascribed to false philosophy more than to religion.—p. 202.

"Work out your own salvation with fear "and trembling, for it is God that worketh in "you, both to will and to do." Be encouraged to proceed; for you are armed with a strength not your own, and a work that is of God, can-

not come to nought; and yet "with fear and trembling;" for the responsibility of a work to which God hath set his hand, is a heavy one,—that should make the heart serious amidst its gladness. These are the words, with which one Christian would naturally comfort and encourage another. And such may well be conceived to be the stress of the Apostle's assertions respecting Grace and Predestination. Could we (p. 203. supra,) read St. Paul's language without prejudice, forgetting the volumes of controversy which have appeared, I feel persuaded, that we should draw no *speculative doctrines*, of Divine Predestination and Grace from his Epistles. Banish these *scientific* notions; nothing can come of them, but the confidence of mere reason, and a false enthusiasm, that fashions the idol before which it prostrates itself. Take up the truths as the Divine Law of Love, and you will find in them something more than that fixedness and quiescence, which is sought in the abstractions of Theory; you will find rest and peace to the soul in Jesus Christ.—p. 203. 204.

15. The assertion, that the Fathers "looked not for transitory promises" is to be traced to the *Scholastic* distinction between implicit and explicit faith. —p. 239.

15. What strivings, indeed, and heart-burnings would have been saved to the Christian world, had the proper negative notion of Faith (not the physical one of an infused principle) been strictly guarded: had Faith been cherished in the heart, simply, as the heaven-sent keeper of God's own sanctuary there, to drive away the proud imaginations of the worldly spirit, and to still the anxieties of the contrite, self-desparing soul. In this sense, Justification by Faith is the sum of Christianity. View the truth in this broad form; and then, to add to the assertion of it, the necessity of *conditions*, is to counteract the proper efficacy of Jesus Christ. But, throw the great Christian Fact into the form of a dogma, and it is immediately acted upon by the philosophy of language. It becomes matter of inquiry, what Faith *is*, what Justification *is*; and *distinctions* are introduced, to obviate consequences from this or that statement.—p. 238. 239.

Note 239. From the scholastic *distinction* between *implicit* and *explicit* Faith, we may trace the assertion, that the "old Fathers "looked not for transitory promises," etc. in order to mark the invariableness and sameness of the object of Faith.

CREEDS AND ARTICLES.

3. Experience proves, that the naked truth of God has been overborne and obscured by the phraseology which Orthodoxy was forced to employ.—p. 375.

1. The notions on which several expressions of the Articles at large, and in particular of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, are founded, are both unphilosophical and unscriptural, belong to ancient theories of philosophy, and are only *less obviously injurious* (sic) to the simplicity of the Faith than those which they exclude. —p. 378.

2. The speculative language of these Creeds was admitted into the Church of England, as established by the Reformers, before the genius of Bacon exposed the *emptiness* of the system, which the Schools had palmed upon the world, as the only instrument for the discovery of all truth.—ib.

3. 1. 2. Dogmas of Theology then, *as such*, are human authorities. But do I mean to say by this, that they are unimportant in Religion, or that they are essentially wrong, foreign to true Religion, and inconsistent with it? I wish rather to establish their importance and proper truth, as distinct from the honour and verity of the simple Divine Word.

We have seen how Doctrines gradually assume their form, by the successive impressions of controversy. The facts of Scripture remain the same through all ages, under all variations of opinions among men. Not so the theories raised upon them. They have floated on the stream of speculation. One heresiarch after another has proposed his modification. The doctrine, so stated, has obtained more or less currency, according to its coincidence with received notions on other subjects,—according to the influence possessed by its patrons, or their obstinacy against persecution. Nearly the whole of Christendom was, at one time, Arian in profession. At one time, Pelagianism seemed to be the ascendant creed of the Church. In such a state of things, it was impossible for the Scriptural theologian, even if not himself susceptible of the seductive force of a Logical Philosophy, to refrain from mingling in the conflict of argument. Orthodoxy was forced to speak the divine truth in the terms of heretical speculation; if it were only to guard against the novelties which the heretic had introduced. It was the necessity of the case that compelled the orthodox, as themselves freely admit, to employ a phraseology, by which, as experience proves, the naked truth of God has been overborne and obscured.

Such being the origin of a Dogmatic Theology, it follows, that its proper truth consists in its being a collection of negations; of negations, I mean, of all ideas imported into Religion, beyond the express sanction of Revelation. Supposing that there had been no theories proposed on the truths of Christianity; were the Bible, or rather the divine facts which it reveals, at once ushered into our notice, without our knowing that various wild notions, both concerning God and human nature, had

been raised upon the sacred truths; no one, I conceive, would wish to see those facts reduced to the precision and number of articles, any more than he now thinks of reducing any other history to such a form. We should rather resist any such attempt as futile, if not as profane: or, however judiciously such a selection might be made, we should undoubtedly prefer the living records of the Divine Agency, to the dry and uninteresting abstracts of human compilers and expositors. But, when theoretic views are known to have been held and propagated; when the world has been familiarized to the language of these speculations, and the truth of God is liable to corruption for them; then it is, that forms of exclusion become necessary, and theory must be retorted by theory. This very occasion, however, of the introduction of Theory into Religion, suggests the limitation of it. It must be strictly confined to the exclusion and rejection of all extraneous notions from the subjects of the sacred volumes. Theory, thus regulated, constitutes a true and valuable philosophy,—not of Christianity, properly so called,—but of human Christianity,—of Christianity in the world, as it has been acted on by the force of the human intellect.

This is the view which I take, not only of our Articles at large, but in particular, of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, as they stand in our Ritual, or are adopted into our Articles. If it be admitted that the notions on which their several expressions are founded, are both unphilosophical and unscriptural; it must be remembered, that they do not impress those notions on the Faith of the Christian, as matters of affirmative belief. They only use the terms of ancient theories of philosophy,—theories current in the Schools at the time when they were written,—to exclude others *more obviously* injurious to the simplicity of the Faith. The speculative language of these Creeds, it should be observed, was admitted into the Church of England as established by the Reformers, before the period, when the genius of Bacon exposed the emptiness of the system, which the Schools had palmed upon the world as the only instrument for the discovery of all Truth. At such a time, accordingly, the theories opposed in the original formularies of the orthodox, would be powerfully felt as real obstacles

to a sound belief in Christian Truths; and the terms, declaring the orthodox doctrine, would be readily interpreted by the existing physical and logical notions. The minds of men would be fully preoccupied with the notions of matter, and form, and substance, and accident; and, when such notions had produced misconception of the sacred Truth, it would be a necessary expedient, to correct that misconception by a less exceptionable employment of them.

If this account of the origin and nature of Dogmatic Theology be correct, surely those entirely pervert its nature, who reason on the Terms of doctrines, as if they were the proper ideas belonging to Religion; or who insist on interpretations of expressions, whether as employed by our Reformers, or the primitive believers, in a positive sense; without taking into their view, the existing state of theology and philosophy at the different periods of Christianity. Creeds and Articles, without such previous study, are as if they were written in a strange language. The words, indeed, are signs of ideas to us, but not of those ideas which were presented to the minds of men, when the formularies were written, or when they were adopted by the Church.

But here the question may be asked, how far on these grounds Creeds and Articles may by retained, when the original occasion for them has ceased? The answer of Hooker will readily occur to many; that, the occasion having ceased, it by no means follows, that the statements themselves should no longer be of use; a fact that may be illustrated by several analogies. But the case of Articles is a peculiar one in this respect; that the result itself is conceived to be an evil, or, at least, an alternative to avoid an evil: it being admitted to be better, except by way of antidote against heretical doctrine, that there should be no other Articles bnt the Word of God itself. It appears to me, then, that the occasion for Articles will probably never cease. Were the Realism of the human mind a transient phenomenon, peculiar to one age, or one species of philosophy, and not, as is the fact, an instinctive propensity of our intellectual nature; then it might be supposed, that the unsoundness of a metaphysical and logical Theology being once fully admitted, the cumbrous machinery might be removed, and the sacred truth al-

lowed to stand forth to view, in its own attractive simplicity. But such a result seems rather to be wished, and prayed for, by a sanguine piety, than reckoned upon in the humbling calculations of human experience. In the mean time, it were well to retain, amidst all its confessed imperfections, a system of technical theology, by which we are guarded, in some measure, from the exorbitance of theoretic enthusiasm. It would be a rashness of pious feeling, that should at once so confide in itself, as to throw down the walls and embankments, which the more vigilant fears of our predecessors have reared up around the City of God. In the presents tate of things, such a zeal for the Faith would look more like the ostentatiousness of Spartan courage, than the modest discipline of the soldiers of Christ, trusting in his arm for success, and yet availing themselves of all natural means of strength, which their reason points out.—p. 375–381.

It is a temptation, indeed, to which the members of any particular communion of Christians are peculiarly exposed—to identify the defence of the formularies of the Communion with the defence of Christianity. It is like securing the fortifications of the city, instead of looking to the strength and discipline of its garrison as the main resource. As belonging to a Communion, we must be able to shew that we have good reason for our preference. And it is enough for this purpose, to prove that our Church is truly Scriptural in its basis, walking in the footsteps of the Holy Spirit, and drinking of the pure fountain of inspiration. This is the sole proper notion of the infallibility of a Church. For it is an infallibility not its own, but of God present with it. We are not called upon, to defend every particular expression which has been adopted into its formularies. This would be, to make it infallible *in itself*. It would be to suppose, that a fortress, strong in its internal resources must fall, because some of its outworks are not impregnable. And we may find indeed at last, that, by such a proceeding, we are tenaciously cleaving to means of defence, which the present state of religion and knowledge entirely supersedes: as we might suppose the inhabitant of a castle fortified in feudal times, imagining himself safe amidst his walls, against assaults from modern inventions in the art of war. —p. 382, 3.

5. The Nicene and Athanasian Creeds involve scholastic speculations.—p. 544.

6. The Apostles' Creed contains nothing but facts.—p. 544.

5. 6. [*Note F. to p.* 379.] The Apostles' Creed states nothing but facts. The transition is immense from this to the scholastic speculations involved in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds, etc. etc.—p. 544.

9. The *positiveness* of doctrines arising from the very nature of systematic statements, is an evil.—p. 238.

9. Some judgment may be formed, from these considerations, to what extent the difficulties attending the notion of Faith, and of Works done before Justification, may be attributed to the abstract theories preserved in the technical language of Theology. And I would draw attention to those theories, therefore, as solutions of the difficulties; and as among the illustrations of the important fact, that there exist perplexities in Theology, which do not involve *real scriptural* difficulties: there arising necessarily a stiffness and positiveness of doctrine, from the very nature of systematic statements.—p. 238.

ORIGINAL SIN.

6. The term *propagation* ("engendered" Article IX.) was introduced into the account of the origin of evil, in order to *prove* its Universality.—p. 221.

10. The idea that the corruption of nature exists in infants, is the result of Theory.—p. 221.

6. 10. Taking then the Scripture facts: that mankind are in a fallen degraded state; that this state is not an accidental one, attributable to any particular generation of men, or period of the world, but that it began with the beginning of our race; that it is a state of moral disorder, offensive to God, and excluding from his favour; that we are therefore in a state of danger, as well as of incapacity of happiness; that, however, God has interposed, in mercy, to save us from the danger, and retrieve this incapacity, by giving his Son Jesus Christ to die for us, whose death is our death unto sin, and his resurrection our resurrection unto holiness and life everlasting; that Repentance and Faith are the great means, by which the benefits of his Passion are brought home to those to whom they are revealed; that much, accordingly, is left to us to do, amidst all our natural weakness and helplessness;—taking, I say, these facts, as a general account of what the Scripture includes under Justification, let us examine into the action of the Scholastic Philosophy, on the doctrines rased on them.—p. 216.

The Scriptures give a history of the first transgression, and declares the universality and perpetuity of moral evil in the world; but they *give no particular account of the mode*, in which it was produced, or of what has rendered it inveterate in the race of man. The Schoolmen set themselves to explain both by the physical and ethical theories of Aristotle.—p. 218, 19.

Their theory of the evil of the world, explains the use of the word "*Corruption*," in its application to the evil of our moral condition. In ancient philosophy, it denotes the dissolution of the actual constitution of a thing, not the annihilation of a nature. It is opposed to "*generation*," signifying that man, as evil, is not the work of God, that he is unmade, as it were, has undergone alteration, is *degenerate*. —p. 219, 20.

The universality of the principle was next to be demonstrated. How could it apply, it was argued, to the case of the infant soul, snatched out of the actual pollutions of the world, as the tender lamb of his flock taken up by the shepherd into his own bosom? The Theorist, not content with referring to the Redeemer's love, as the simple earnest of the blessedness of the little infant, sought *how* to connect this fact with the universal need of redemption. This occasioned the introduction of the term *Propagation* into the account of the origin of evil. If the corruption of nature descended by "*propagation*," then it would exist in the guileless infant.—p. 221.

5. The Pelagians asserted that the first sin was hurtful to the human race, not by *propagation* but by *example*: though their language inadequately expresses the inveteracy of the sinfulness of human nature, *their grounds were right*, so far as they endeavoured to give a *moral* account of the fact,

5. The Pelagians, however, were not satisfied with the above account of the matter. Pelagius believed, as fully as those he opposed, that mankind were in a worse state, in consequence of the first sin; but, he contended that it was hurtful by *example*, not by *propagation*, "*non propagine, sed exemplo*;" admitting, however, that infants were not in the same state as Adam before transgression, on the ground that he was capable of obeying a precept, whilst they had not, as yet, the exercise of free-will..... Though the language of the Pelagians did not accurately express the inveteracy of that sinfulness of human nature, which Scripture and the world declare with one voice; we must allow, I think, that they were right in their grounds, so far as they attempted to give a moral account

and *their opponents were wrong*, so far as they endeavoured to give a *physical* or *material* account of it.—p. 222, 3.

of the fact; and that their opponents were wrong, so far as they attempted to give a physical or material account of it. Their theory of human sinfulness sufficiently accounted for the *actual* sins of men. It shewed how our nature might be depraved or improved; that its actual depravation consisted in transgressions, like those of the First Parent; but it left unexplained the *tendency* to sin existing in human nature; a fact evidenced in the self-denial which right conduct exacts; the law warring against the members, something beyond merely assimilating ourselves to the first transgressor, more intimate with our feelings.—p. 222.

3. The Orthodox ought to have contented themselves with the *name* of Original Sin, to designate the moral *fact* of the *tendency* (sic) to sin, in human nature.—p. 224.

4. In defining and pronouncing upon it, they essayed, what Scripture had not authorized, to explain the mode of human corruption.—p. 224. 5.

3. 4. It had been well, if the orthodox had contented themselves with the name of Original Sin, to designate this moral fact; and while they disclaimed the Pelagian theory of Imitation, as inadequate to account for it, themselves abstained from speculating on the subject. But disputation called upon them to define and pronounce. They thus essayed what neither Scripture had authorized [by its records,] nor human reason could reach:—to explain the mode of human corruption; to analyze, by language, the thing denoted by the term Original Sin, when the only subject before them was a general fact, requiring to be simply and clearly stated. (See this principle adopted Article IX. of Church of England.)—p. 224–5.

7. A positive deterioration of our nature is a Scholastic notion.—p. 225.

7. The positive manner, in which Augustine declares the transmission of the material element of corruption from Adam to the whole race of mankind, laid the groundwork of the above Scholastic discussions on the subject. The idea that prevails throughout these, is of a positive deterioration of the "concupiscible part of the soul".... It was stated, accordingly, that the flesh was vitiated by the sin of the first man, the intellect itself not being contaminated.—p. 225, 6.

1. The language of the Article on

1. 2. 8. Our Church, happily, has avoided that extreme dogmatism on the subject, which

Original Sin bears the impress of the Scholastic theories. —p 228.

8. The strength of the expression "*very far gone from original righteousness*," is to be estimated, by comparing the fallen condition of man with the Scholastic notion of his first estate.—p. 228.

2. There is in the Article on Original Sin *a train of thought* following the *speculations* of the Schools.

the Scholastic philosophy instances, and which some of her own members would elicit from her language. We find, indeed, *the term* of the schools adopted in the Article on Original Sin. But it does not expressly assert its descent in the way of propagation; it does not, in fact, define the nature of the thing, though it appears to do so in terms: it only lays down its effects, their depth, and their universal extent. It is impossible, at the same time, to deny, that its language on the subject bears the impress of the Scholastic theories. And those expositors of her doctrine, who would draw from this article a sentence of what is called "total corruption," i. e. of the soul having undergone a *dissolution*, so as to be no longer in any respect what it was, appear to me to take an improper advantage of these theoretic expressions. —p. 228.

Note p. 228. The strength of the expressions, "*quam proxime*" and "*very far gone*," is to be estimated by their opposition to that transcendant holiness, which human nature may be conceived to have possessed, while yet instinct with original righteousness. Compare the fallen condition of man with the scholastic notion of his first state, [the perfect image of God,] and no words can be strong enough to tell the depth to which he has fallen.

9. The belief, that, to counteract the living death, in which we by nature are, a new life from God must be imparted, is a consequence of the Scholastic doctrine of Original sin.—p. 235.

9. It was a consequence of this notion of Original Sin, that the elements of the Christian Life should be, in *the strictest sense*, a change, a transformation, a renewal. It was necessary we should be "born again;" to counteract that living death within us, a new life must be imparted. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive. If we regard this reasoning as a description of conjoined events in each case, it is scripturally just. The connection of the universal ruin of man, with the sin of the first transgressor; and the connection of Universal Salvation, with the righteousness of Christ, are facts which the word of truth has inseparably bound together. What I am now pointing out, however, is the *logical deduction* of one from the other, in the scholastic theory.—p. 235.

FAITH.

2. The notion that Faith is a source of the knowledge of God, is derived from an eclectic philosophy, in which the mystycism of Plato was blended with the analytic method of Aristotle.—p. 80.

2. Given the nature of the Divine Being; given the principles themselves immediately as they existed in Him; there could be no doubt of the truth of the conclusions deduced from them. But it was admitted that the nature of God, *as He is in Himself*, is incomprehensible by the human faculties; that we cannot attain in the present life to the knowledge of his essence. This difficulty might appear insuperable. But it was not so to the Schoolman versed in an eclectic philosophy, etc. . . . . The principle of *faith* here answered the purpose of solving the speculative difficulty, as well as of securing the prescriptive right of Authority. Theology could not discover the principles on which it reasoned—through Faith, it might have its ground, on which to build its airy edifice of speculation.—p. 80.

1. The priority, which is ascribed in such strong terms in our Articles to Faith, among the acts of a Christian life, is accounted for by the *physical* notion of faith as an *infused* principle, the *origin* of a new life, held by the Schoolmen.—p. 236, 7.

1. It is important to observe accurately this physical notion of Faith, as an infused principle, (see *Aquin.* S. Theol. Prima IIdæ, qu. LXXXI. art. 3.) the *origin* of a new life; because it serves to account for the *priority*, which is ascribed in such strong terms, in our Articles, to Faith, among the acts of the Christian life. . . . . Scripture, indeed, asserts the difficulty, the folly, the sinfulness of any endeavour to work out our own salvation on our own strength; and lays such stress on the principle which sends us to the altar of the Cross. But not employing [like the Schoolmen] *definitions* in its delivery of Divine Truth, it avoids that paradoxical air, which appears in all systematic developments of the nature of Faith. —p. 236, 7.

3. The difficulties attending the notion of *Faith* and *Works done before Justification*, may to a great extent be attributed to the abstract *theories* preserved in the technical language of Theology.—p. 238.

3. Vid. Proposition 9. "On Creeds and Articles," supra.

4. Faith ought to have been held in a negative sense only.—Ib.

4. Vid. Proposition 15. "On Holy Scripture," supra.

GRACE.

4. The conception produced in the mind by speaking of grace *operating* and *co-operating*, grace *preventing* and *following*, is very erroneous. —p. 187.

3. Those subdivisions . . . . of 'preventing' and 'following' grace, grace 'operating' and 'co-operating,' and others which our Church has not adopted, are expressly taken from the Scholastic Theology.—p. 188.

2. When we are desired to pray for 'grace,' and 'grace' is said to be given to us, a dogmatic impression is conveyed; but more strictly, they are *concise modes of speaking*, for the purpose of giving a distinct and striking view of *the fact* of God's benevolent condescension. —Ib.

1. The positive sense of grace is derived from Scholasticism.—Ib.

4. 3. 2. 1. 5. The sense, which the discussions of Pelagianism have impressed on this term, is particularly to be noticed. The *dogmatic* manner in which we now speak of "the grace of God,"—placing it in contrast with the powers of human nature, or with nature in general,—conveys the idea of something *positive* in God, something that admits of explanation as to what it is,—of definition, and distribution into its various kinds. We hear of grace *operating* and *co-operating*; grace *preventing* and *following*; grace of *congruity*, and grace of *condignity*. But how erroneous is the conception produced in the mind, by these several modes of speaking? When we try the notion of Grace by a survey of the Scripture-dispensations, what is it but a general *fact*, a summary designation of the various instances of benevolent, pitiful condescension on the part of God, to the wants and helplessness of man? It is thus that "grace and truth" are said to come by Jesus Christ. St. Paul speaks of the mission of Jesus Christ as the grace of God, which hath appeared unto all men. Thus, too, we are said to be "saved by grace." Again, we are desired to pray for "grace,"—and grace is said to be "given" to us. These last instances certainly convey a *dogmatic* impression; but when we consider them more strictly, they resolve themselves into concise modes of speaking, adapted to the purpose of giving a distinct and striking view of the fact to which reference has been made. We pray, that is, that God will graciously help us; and, in acknowledging the gift of grace, we deny our own sufficiency, and *declare, that what we do good, is of God working in us both to will and to do*.....

It is then from Scholasticism that we have derived this positive sense. Those subdivisions, and others which our Church has not adopted, are expressly taken from the Scholastic Theology. Grace is treated of in this system, as something "*infused*" into the soul,

5. To regard Grace as something 'infused' into the soul, by virtue of which the sinner is justified, and the operation of which on the heart is to be traced through the stages of its process, is part of the Scholastic system.—p. 188, 9.

by virtue of which the sinner is justified, and the operation of which on the heart is endeavoured to be traced through the stages of its process.—p. 189.

THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

4. The assertion of a real and true presence of Christ in the Eucharist, resulted from the Original Platonism of the Church.—p. 72.

4. The conflicts of argument at an earlier period, [than the period of Albert and Aquinas, XIII. century,] shew the unsettled state of opinion as to the principle of the system, [realist Theology,] which those several efforts were tending to erect. The questionings, of the IXth century on the nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, evince a doubt as to the point were the evidence of the senses ends, or how far such evidence might be admitted against internal convictions of the mind. Here the original Platonism of the Church ruled the case. A Real Presence was asserted, which implied the deceptiveness of the senses. —p. 72.

3. The notion that the Sacraments are visible channels, through which virtue is conveyed from Christ himself, to his mystical body, the Church, is part of the theoretic view of the Scholastic Philosophy.—p. 311.

3. As the incarnation itself was an union of the Divine Word with human nature, so the Sacraments, according to the theoretic view of the Scholastic philosophy, were mystical unions of words with sensible things, by which the real Passion of Christ was both signified and applied to the soul of man—the visible channels, through which virtue was conveyed to the mystical body, his Church.—p. 311.

1. The doctrine of the Sacraments is based upon the mystical philosophy

1. In this respect, the mystical philosophy of secret agents in nature, was christianized. But, though it might thus be denied, that any proper efficacy was attributed to the symbol

of secret agents in nature, christianized.—p. 314, 15.

employed in the administration of a Sacrament, still its power of communicating grace *instrumentally*, was asserted in the strongest manner.—p. 315.

2. The ready reception of the theory, that Christ, as the sole primary cause of grace, conved that grace through the Sacraments, as subordinate instrumental causes, by which the Divine agency accomplished *its* ends, is sufficiently accounted for by the general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church. ib.

2. See Propositions, 30, 29. Trinitarian Articles, supra.

N. B. The word '*its*,' marked in italics in in the column of Propositions, has no existence whatever in Dr. Hampden's passage.

6. It was in just logical connection with the scholastic theory [preserved by the Church of England] that the Latin theology deduced the Seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome. —p. 313.

6. The definition, indeed, given in the Catechism of the Church of England, is exactly what the Scholastic theory suggests; so far, at least, as the language of it characterizes the nature of a Sacrament. It is, in the subsequent application of this definition, that the Church of England *has modified and improved* upon the fundamental idea of the Scholastic doctrine.

It was, however, in just logical connection with this theory, that the Latin Theology deduced the Seven Sacraments of the Church of Rome.—p. 313.

5. The Church of England doctrine of the Sacrament is founded on the views of an author, who asserted this. —p. 320. She has, though in a modified form, preserved the fundamental idea of the Scholastic doctrine.—p. 313.

5. The collision of adverse statement, forced them [the orthodox] into a precision of language, which, probably, but for the force of controversy, would have had no place in Theology. It is no inconsiderable evidence of this observation, that the precision of language has occurred on that particular Sacrament, which was the immediate matter of discussion,—the Eucharist. The nature of Christ's presence in *Baptism* might have been attempted, no less, to be defined: but here the point is left comparatively open to opinion; whilst, respecting the Eucharist, the path of orthodoxy is rigidly marked out to the disciple of the scholastic theology.—p. 319.

In denying an actual communication of Christ to the sacred emblems, it became necessary to guard against the construction of a merely commemorative rite, and thus evacuating the Sacrament of its holy burthen of Grace. For neither Ratramn, in opposing the doctrine of Paschase, nor afterwards Berenger, in advocating the views of Erigena against Lanfranc, appear to have held, that the Eucharist was *nothing more* than a sign. Ratramn, indeed, distinctly asserts a *real* presence, though he does *not admit a presence of the crucified* body of *Christ in the consecrated bread and wine*. . . . The Church of England doctrine of the Sacrament, it is well-known, is founded on the views given by this author. Cranmer and Ridley are said to have studied his book together. . . . —p. 320, ad fin.

7. The whole doctrine and ritual of Christianity in the system of the Church of Rome, may be drawn from this primary notion of sacramental *efficiency*.—p. 321.

7. The relative importance of the Eucharist, in comparison with the other Sacraments, and, indeed, with the whole doctrine and ritual of Christianity, in the system of the Church of Rome, may be drawn from the *primary* notion [of *actual communication*] of sacramental efficiency. . I do not say, that it ought not to hold a principal station among the observances of a holy life. But it is *the doctrinal supremacy* given to it, to which I am referring. View it, as it exists in the Roman Church, and it is there found absorbing in itself the whole, it may be said, of Christian worship. To be set apart for its celebration seems to be the chief purpose, the essence, of the Roman priesthood. Whilst the other Sacraments, recognised by that theory, *participate* of the virtue of Christ's passion, this is the *passion itself*, of Christ, etc. —p. 321.

8. The faith of the receiver is the true *consecrating* principle of the Sacraments.—p. 323.

8. We are ready, indeed, to admit ourselves, that the vice of the Minister does not impede the effect of the Sacrament. For it is evident, that where the Faith of the Receiver is the true consecrating principle,—that which really brings down Christ to the heart of each individual,—the personal delinquency of him who administers it cannot deteriorate the Sacrament, itself.—p. 323. (vide Art. XXVI. Ch. of Eng.)

10. The use of the expressions, being made "a member of the

10. It was an admirable expedient, indeed, of ecclesiastical policy, thus to rest the power of the Church on the purity and indefectibility of an abstraction. Religious imagination was sustained on the picture of the Church, as the

body of Christ," or being "incorporated" ("engrafted into the Church," Art. XXVII.) as equivalent, is owing to the *confusion of ideas* prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism.—p. 324, 5.

great Mother of the Faithful, cherishing her beloved children in her pure bosom.—p. 324.

Note, p. 324. We should observe the confusion of ideas prevalent in the early Church on the subject of Baptism. The Church was considered as "*the body of Christ.*" The Church also was "*the mother of the faithful.*" Hence, being baptized, and being made a "member of *the body* of Christ," and being "incorporated" into the Church, became equivalent expressions. Hence, too, the Church was said to "*generate*" sons by Baptism. *Augustin.* contra Donatist. c. 10. et alib.

12. Conditional Baptism is a Scholastic provision.—p. 327.

12. Baptism, and other Sacraments, were conceived to impress a *Character* on the soul; and it was hence maintained, that it could not be repeated... Cyprian, indeed, maintained the contrary: requiring, that those which had been Baptized by heretics, should be re-baptized by the orthodox; but the opposite doctrine was established on the authority of St. Augustine. ... We may perceive a trace of the scholastic doctrine of "impressed character;" in the scrupulous care shewn by our Church in the Baptismal service, to ascertain whether Baptism has already been performed rightly—and in the provision (itself a scholastic one) of conditional Baptism, in cases where doubt may exist of its previous due administration. —p. 326, 7.

9. The inquiries in our Baptismal Service, "With what *matter* was this child baptized?" "With what *words*," etc. "Because some things," it is said, "*essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted," are derived from the subtle speculations about *matter* and *form*, introduced to establish and perfect theory of *instrumental efficiency*

9. In a manner analagous to the original formation of all things by the Divine Word acting on matter, it was conceived, that the sacred words pronounced by the Priest came with power to the element or *matter*, and imposed on it a mystical or sacramental *form*. Thus a Sacrament has been described as consisting of *matter* and *form*.—p. 335.

Note, p. 336. Hence the inquiries in our Baptismal Service. "With what *matter* was this child baptized?" "With what *words* was this child baptized?" "Because some things (it is said) *essential* to this Sacrament may happen to be omitted through haste."

ascribed to the rites themselves. —p. 335.

11. The decision as to the intrinsic *efficacy* of the rite of Baptism can be only speculation.—p. 344.

11. But, though we are free from the yoke which the Sacramental ritual imposes on the members of the Roman Communion, we still require watchfulness against the temptation to refine on the subject, and lest we enslave ourselves to a kind of priestcraft in our own minds. The tendency to raise questions about Baptism, in modern times, is an evidence of this spirit of refinement. Men are not content with the simple declarations; "Repent, and be baptized:"—"Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit," etc.: "Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father," etc.: nor will they acquiesce in the duty of conforming their practice to these Scriptural injunctions. But it is thought by some, that the question must be further decided, whether Baptism is in all cases equivalent to Regeneration. They propose a question, that is, as to the intrinsic efficacy of the rite;—a difficulty, which practical Christianity by no means calls upon us to decide, and the decision of which, after all, can be only speculation. In regard, indeed, to both the Sacraments, singleness of heart is the only human means, that we possess, of apprehending their true import. [Ends with quotation from Hooker, Eccl. Pol. v. 67.]—p. 343.

15. Transubstantiation is connected with the Scholastic Theory of the Trinity. —p. 535.

15. The Christian philosopher of the schools conceived the *Divine words* uttered, to carry that mystical creative force, which belonged to the *Divine Word* as existing in the Trinity.

Note.—Aquinas, Sum. Theol. IIItia Pars, qu. LXXVIII. art. 4.—Note K.

[The passage quoted, (Prop. 15), is extracted from note K. which contains the quotation from Aquinas above referred to.

RELATION OF NATURAL MORALITY TO RELIGION.

3. The maxim, that the business of man is the imita-

3. According to the Platonic doctrine, morality was based on immutable speculative principles, the abstract species, the real constituents, according to his view, of every thing

tion of God, is derived from Plato, and is the commencement of the confusion of morals and theology.—p. 271.

denominated good. This was to take morality out of the sphere of man's moral nature, and place it in a kind of philosophical pietism. He rejected, accordingly, the notion, that man was the "measure" of moral excellence, and admitted no standard of human perfection below that of the Deity Himself. His religion and his morality coincided in the maxim, that the business of man was the Imitation of God. Thus was the confusion of ethical and theological truth begun in that method of philosophy, which first obtained the sanction of the Christian Church. The principle of the Imitation of God, so elevating in its conception, and so *accordant with the language of Scripture*, being found in the volumes of philosophy,—a precedent was established, for conjoining the two classes of truth in one promiscuous speculation.—p. 271.

6. The *religious principle* is not to be substituted for morality as the *spring of action*.—p. 300.

6. We are apt to speak of Religion, as supplying fresh *motives* of conduct. But, in fact, the principles of our moral nature are the *motives*, the *only motives* to actions, as, to use an imperfect analogy, the springs and wheels of a machine are the motives to its action: and the truths of Christianity are presented to those principles, as *objects* towards which they should tend. . . . . This confusion of *results* (unfolded by Religion) with the *motives* of human conduct takes place, when the religious principle is substituted as the spring of action: when it is argued, for instance, that no action can have any moral value, except it be done *immediately*, and *exclusively*, on a *motive* of glory to God. The glory of God supplies, indeed, the great religious centre of our actions: they are *incomplete and irreligious, if they terminate in worldly objects*. But our actions must still be performed according to the laws of our nature. They must originate within us; they must be morally right in themselves, in order to their sanctification in the great *object*, which Religion holds out to our view.—p. 300.

8. The popular belief in the separate existence of the soul is a remnant of Scholasticism.—p. 310.

8. This notion of the separate existence of the soul has so incorporated itself with Christian Theology, that we are apt, at this day, to regard a belief in it as essential to orthodox doctrine. Even in maintaining that such a belief is not essential to Christianity, I may incur the appearance of impugning a vital truth of religion. I cannot, however, help viewing this popular belief as a remnant of scholasticism. I

feel assured that the truth of the Resurrection does not depend on such an assumption; that the Life and Immortality of man, as resting on Christ raised from the dead, is a certain fact in the course of Divine Providence; whatever may be the theories of the soul, and of its connexion with the body.—p. 310.

FINIS.

OXFORD: PRINTED BY TALBOYS AND BROWNE.

OBSERVATIONS

ON A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO HIS GRACE

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

EXPLANATORY OF THE

PROCEEDINGS AT OXFORD, ON THE APPOINTMENT OF THE PRESENT REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY.

BY MISOPSEUDES.

Stultus est labor ineptiarum. MARTIAL.

Καί πού τι καὶ βροτῶν φρένας
Ὑπὲρ τόν ἀλαθῆ λόγον
Δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις
Ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι. PIND. CARM. OLYMP. i. 44—7.

OXFORD:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY J. VINCENT;
1836.

Sed non ego credulus illis. VIRGIL.

When one breaks in upon the usual course of his studies and pursuits, and condescends to notice the vapid nonsense of an interested libeller, he cannot but be conscious that he is lowering himself by being brought into contact, however unwillingly, with the defilements of deliberate falsehood. In undertaking therefore, the office of animadverting on a certain pamphlet, which has appeared within the last day or two, professing by a strange misnomer to be "*explanatory* of the proceedings at Oxford in the appointment of the present Regius Professor of Divinity," I would wish to guard my readers against the idea, that this absurd composition is really in itself worthy of an answer; but as I know the interest which all orders and degrees, feel on the present discussion at Oxford; I will, in the hope of performing some benefit, even at the risk of any degradation to which I subject myself, by entering into

an apparent controversy with a fabricator of lies, attempt to demonstrate to what base and unworthy arts they are obliged to have recourse, who, for the gratification of some spleen—or it may be of some *friendship—grateful friendship*, rouse themselves to the task of impugning conduct the most straightforward, and motives the most pure.

As I have only a very few hours to spare for the prosecution of this ungrateful task, it will be the easier—and probably too, it will be the most efficient way of exposing and neutralizing the effects of this mendacious pamphlet, to quote from its pages such statements as are without a shadow of truth—in some instances placing in contrast with them, the true and incontrovertible facts of the case; and here my only difficulty is that of selection, for I use no trope or figure of speech, when I denominate the *whole* statement to be an uninterrupted *falsehood.* I will accordingly select for refutation *at hazard*, such passages as my eyes first fix on, with the single preliminary observation, that the pamphleteer's intellectual weakness is only to be equalled by his moral depravity.

"They have required your Grace to express a condemnation of your own conduct, if being aware of his being a Socinian you omitted to protest

against Dr. Hampden's nomination; or of your own judgment, if (as I understand is the case) you declared *that you knew of no objection whatever to him as a* THEOLOGIAN," p. 4.

The writer knew this to be "*false.*"

"It cannot be alleged that these Lectures escaped observation; *they attracted the notice of the late Lord Grenville, who, as Chancellor of the University, promoted Dr. Hampden to the Headship of St. Mary Hall.*" p. 5.

False, and the more mean because it is disingenuous, and concludes that to be a *cause* which was undoubtedly only an *antecedent.* Lord Grenville never *did* appoint Dr. Hampden to the Headship of St. Mary Hall, on the ground of approval of his Bampton Lectures, which is the idea, that the luckless pamphleteer intends to convey.

" They (*i. e.* his Bampton Lectures) were reviewed in the leading literary periodical publications, and in some at great length; but nowhere was there any insinuation of the author's dangerous, much more (I suppose the unhappy gentleman meant to say much *less*) of his heretical opinions." p. 5.

False again and *disingenuous,* for Dr. H.'s " Observations on Religious Dissent," which in

many points are but an *epexegesis* of the principles contained in his Bampton Lectures, were animadverted on most ably and powerfully at the time of their publication by the "British Critic and Theological Quarterly Review of January, 1835."

"The first step taken was to call a private meeting, (a hole-and-corner cabal,) of certain members of the University at Corpus College." p. 9.

False, the meeting was open *to all Members of Convocation.*

"The results of these *fair* and *candid* labours are believed to exist in the pages of the 'Elucidations,' a work which, though it appears to the public as the industry of one man, is really the mighty effort of the first meeting held at Corpus." p. 11.

Totally and entirely *false*, neither the first or any other Meeting at Corpus had any thing whatever to do with the publication of the "Elucidations."

"The next step was an attempt to excite the Undergraduates to declare heretical, that which the Heads of the University could not discover to be even dangerous." p. 12.

False, a petition from the Undergraduates was

set on foot, and was *stopped* by the exertions of the Fellows and Tutors of the different Colleges; and it is well known, that a most influential and zealous member of Convocation, who has taken a most active part in the present proceedings, informed the Undergraduates of his own College, that their conduct on that occasion was more like a *rebellion*, than any thing he had ever remembered at Oxford.

"These other writings were appealed to as testimonies of his fitness," by those who recommended him to that office (i. e. of Bampton Lecturer.) p. 13.

Totally *false*, these "other writings" to which the requisitionists referred, were his Moral Philosophy Lectures, his Observations on Religious Dissent, &c. which did not appear till long *after* he was made Bampton Lecturer.

"The opposition is that of an *interested minority*, swelled doubtless by signatures industriously hunted up, to the number of seventy-six (such at least is the amount as we are told of those who signed one of the Petitions.) I believe I am stating the number very low, when I say that on an average about two hundred Resident Members of Convocation are to be found in Oxford during term time." p. 16.

Our pamphleteer is getting cautious as he grows old—he has positively tried to save his credit by inserting a "doubtless;" "doubtless by signatures industriously hunted up." I will answer him then in his own cautious language, *doubtless* there was not *one* signature industriously hunted up—*doubtless* there are not any thing *near* two hundred Members of Convocation resident in term time. If we exclude from the number the Heads of Houses, (whom on any ingenuous and honest principle of calculation on this question we *must* exclude,) the Resident Members of Convocaion do not exceed one hundred and sixty; one hundred and eighteen or one hundred and nineteen of whom have signed their names to different requisitions on the subject of the appointment of Dr. Hampden to the chair of Divinity. Of those who remain, a great proportion consists of Chaplains, who do not generally interfere on subjects of University disputation.

"Upon Dr. Pusey's speaking, sixteen or seventeen of the party assembled left the Meeting with a declaration, that it was a dirty, personal affair, and they would have nothing more to do with it." p. 17.

Pure fiction! but let us pause to observe the mendacious ingenuity of the writer, "sixteen or

seventeen left the Meeting;" what a most exact calculation! left it too with a *declaration*. Can this declaration be the "untimely fruit" of a *certain* advertisement, of a *certain* Meeting proposed to be held by *certain* Members of Convocation, at an *uncertain* time, and an *uncertain* place? But seriously it is distressing to think that an "*unfeathered biped*" (are not asses by the bye quadrupeds?) could sit down and commit to writing such gross and palpable fictions. I have now adverted to some of the "*explanatory*" observations of this most veracious pamphleteer; with considerable weariness and disgust to myself, which I fear will be communicated to my readers. I will hasten therefore to conclude this part of the subject, only adding for the gratification of the author of the "letter," that we are all of us most busily engaged in tracing out the "Senior Fellow of a College, who declared *with an oath* that though he knew nothing of the business he would nevertheless sign the petition, "*because it was against the Ministers*;" and should we be so successful as to trace the *impiety* to its pure source, we will "indulge the University with the fun of a row."

And now Mr. Pamphleteer, if you have conceded to a most able and excellent man, the merit

of transplanting to Oxford, the "Irish arts of agitation" you may without any presumption vindicate to yourself the honour of having transferred thither, the "Irish arts" of *lying*; for that any human being—that any one being endowed with a spirit, less diabolical than that of the "father of lies" himself, should have employed two or three hours in *pure invention*, (for you have not stopped at exaggeration) is a consideration replete with pain and disgrace. You have attached to your letter the signature of "a Member of the University of Oxford." Is not this a *pure invention* likewise? I trust it is, for thus you will have preserved an honourable consistency in falsehood to the end, and we shall be freed from the painful consideration, that Oxford enrolls amongst her sons, one whose designs against her honour are most extensive, and who is only prevented from accomplishing those designs by a thickness of head which would do no discredit to Bœotia itself. If that signature be a *bona fide* one, you are only another example of the fact, that weeds will grow up in the richest soil, and fatten on the finest pasture; in either case assume not any longer the mask of the "great unknown," your *powers of fiction are unrivalled*—and you may perchance, by a steady perseverance in your

present *honourable* course, obtain the well merited post of Poet's corner in the Satirist or Bell's Life.

In the mean time, if royal bounty or private munificence should, at some future day, endow a Professorship of "Mendacity," let me assure you in all sincerity, that you shall have all the interest that I can give you. Your qualifications for such an office none can doubt—Oxford will not then be able to exclaim against the unworthiness of her Professor—merit will at length have met with its reward—and we cannot then complain any longer that offices of trust and *credit* in this University are given away in an inverse ratio to the qualifications of the Candidate.

ERRATA.

P. 9. l. 23. for *pure* read *true*.

VINCENT, PRINTER, OXFORD.

STATE OF PARTIES IN OXFORD.

FROM THE PUBLIC PRINTS.

WITH AN APPENDIX

CONTAINING SOME LETTERS RELATIVE TO

THE PERSECUTION

OF THE

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY.

LONDON: B. FELLOWES, LUDGATE-STREET.

OXFORD; D. A. TALBOYS:

M DCCC XXXVI.

STATE OF PARTIES,

&c.

"THE spirit of Laud is yet ascendant at Oxford. The Protestant Dissenters have succeeded to the honours of implacable hatred from that section of Churchmen, whose exclusive pretensions to Protestantism consist, in having supplanted the more orthodox Papists, and substituted for one Pope divers Anti-Popes. We stated yesterday a *fact* which may have startled some of our readers—namely, that the military Chancellor of Oxford has proved himself too friendly to the cause of *religious comprehension;* and that the square-heads who exalted him by acclamation, as the fittest hand, if need were, to wield the sword of St. Peter in their behalf, are now in arms with equal zeal against the promotion of the only Head of a college, whose views accord with those of their chosen Chancellor, in favour of the voluntary admission of Dissenters by the abolition of obsolete tests, as a preferable alternative to their gates being forced open by parliament. Lord Clarendon might well say of these gowned politicians, that they know the least, and judge the worst, of human affairs, of all men that can write and read. Here have they selected for Chancellor, a chief of a party the most friendly to all their pretensions and privileges; yet the soldier and the layman proves so much too liberal, though a Tory, to content their blind bigotry, that the one Head of a college who agrees with the Head of his university as to the policy of opening a door to Dissenters, is thereby deemed to forfeit all the rewards of eminent merit, and becomes thenceforth the lawful object of persecution and contumely.

(Globe, Feb. 12.)

"It appears that the Oxford Heads of Houses have decided on submitting to Convocation the same bill of pains and penalties against Dr. HAMPDEN, which was thrown out by the veto of the Proctors last term; by the same majority which carried it on the former occasion in the Hebdomadal meeting[a]. Of the result of the proposition, which we suppose will now meet with no impediment from the Proctors, there can probably be no doubt: and we congratulate the enemies of Oxford and the church on the prospect. The debate is fixed (as our Oxford correspondent has announced) for Thursday in next week.

"No writer can be fairly judged of by extracting single propositions out of works of connected argument; the test is more especially unfair when applied to an author whose subject involves such wide and various matters of speculation as are comprised in the sciences of moral philosophy and theology, and most of all when applied to a writer of the turn and temper of mind of Dr. HAMPDEN. It is a characteristic of his mind, as displayed in his writings.—and we say it with no view to critical praise or blame, but only to illustrate the manner in which he has been treated—to carry his inquiries to the utmost limits of analysis—to strip received opinions and notions of the conventional language in which they are commonly enveloped, and expose them nakedly and broadly, in order the better to compare them with other deductions on the same subjects, either by way of contrast or of parallel: to state the proposition in one part of his argument, and to limit it, circumscribe it, or bring others to bear upon it, in another. It is perfectly clear that such a writer as we have described (and we

[a] On the former occasion, had not two members of the Board, who would have voted with the minority, been accidentally absent, the division would have been 13 to 12; giving only a majority of one.

think a little acquaintance with Dr. HAMPDEN's works will show that we have described him justly) is, above all others, exposed to that species of misrepresentation of which we complain. He, above all others, required to be judged not by insulated passages, but by fair and careful induction. Yet in all the pamphlets with which we have met on the persecuting side of the question, we have not found a single one in which this manly and straightforward process has been resorted to. Manliness and straightforwardness seldom characterise the workings of the "odium theologicum." All the evidence adduced against Dr. HAMPDEN seems to be of the same character: *partial* extracts, *suppressions*, insinuations. Such has ever been the course adopted by the persecutors of free opinion. "Extracting heretical propositions" has been the uniform process resorted to, whenever the object has been to silence, or to burn, obnoxious reasoners. It was by the same course, of word-catching and extract-making, that the accusers of SOCRATES converted his philosophy into atheism. The same course is adopted when the church of Rome condemns a book of dubious orthodoxy to the Index Expurgatorius. The same course was adopted by Spanish inquisitors, or Queen MARY's commissioners, when it was the fashion to consign the authors of such books to the flames. And—might we venture on such an allusion without irreverence—when the "false witnesses" sought to please the persecuting Jews by laying snares for innocent blood, it was not by mere fiction, but by perversely *selecting fragments of discourses* to which a false interpretation might be affixed, that they endeavoured to accomplish their end[b].

"We have been led into these observations by the perusal of a pamphlet which has just appeared, entitled

[b] The evasion now adopted by the Party, is to call their unfair extracts, "condensed" passages.

"Remarks intended to show how far Dr. HAMPDEN may have been misrepresented and misunderstood during the present controversy at Oxford." The author, Mr. HULL, calls himself "a true churchman and a true Tory," and we see no reason to doubt in his fully meriting both epithets: on the present occasion we are glad that he assumes the latter, as, although we might on other grounds wish him a good deliverance from such erroneous opinions, it is satisfactory to find that Tories also can take a just and reasonable view of the present discussion. We refer our readers with pleasure to his pages for many proofs of the manner in which the context of Dr. HAMPDEN's writings elucidates or modifies the single propositions which have been so industriously extracted by his enemies, and must content ourselves with citing some of his concluding paragraphs:—

"These are painful subjects to those who, like myself, love and honour Oxford, as feeling their obligations to the University where they were educated. We must look to Oxford mainly to restore and maintain the integrity of church and state, *so impaired by what are miscalled the reforms of modern legislators.* It is to Oxford we must look for the maintenance of sound religion and useful learning. Our religion, to be sound in its establishment, must have learning; our learning, to be of any use to its possessors, must have religion. Dr. Hampden is now proving that what is *substance* in our church formularies is true and her own; and further, that what is *manner* is defensible, however others may object to it, when rightly understood and fairly taken, yet not her own. She wisely adopted a settled phraseology at the time of the Reformation, and would do well now to take up and carry on the work of our Reformers. It is right that every voice, however feeble, should deprecate the fierce and unjustifiable persecution Dr. Hampden is now suffering, because it is evident he prefers substance to manner, and is asserting that true learning will clear up true religion. He sets men's souls upon their due use

of the means of grace; and the evidence of their safety upon their conduct rather than their creeds. He will not allow the Bible to be disparaged by putting it on the same platform with uninspired teachers and expounders. . . . Our people, and not our clergy, make our church: our Bibles, and not our formularies, are the basis of our faith. Our formularies have been misconstrued and misapplied: they are, therefore, capable of misconstruction and misapplication. Dr. Hampden shows how this happens: and is therefore persecuted by those who are determined to rank our formularies on a level with our Bibles, and seem almost anxious that our church should teach for doctrines the commandments of men."

"Among the most zealous opponents of Dr. HAMPDEN, and one of the earliest in the field, was Mr. NEWMAN, himself known at Oxford as a writer on various ecclesiastical subjects. A more honest and sincere man is not to be found; the more pity that his name should have been so much mixed up with these transactions[c]. We cite that name without ceremony, because it has already been made generally public on this occasion. Now, Mr. NEWMAN, and others of his school are commonly accused of a strong leaning to sentiments, if not opinions, savouring of "Popery." They are said to aim at establishing a sort of *quasi*-Catholic sheme, and investing the collective church, or rather clergy, with attributes approaching to infallibility, and to attach to tradition more weight than the ordinary interpretation of our Articles allows, or even than their words would admit. Would Mr. NEWMAN be content—on a question involving his reputation even more than his interests—to be judged on extracts carefully made by his political enemies? We say judged, because, as comparatively few, even among Oxford convocation voters, care to read books of theology through, from the moment that such extracts are published, they are

[c] See letter of Aliquis, p. 21.

forthwith seized on as texts, by those who are only anxious to justify their own party conduct. We find in the *Edinburgh Review* the following passage, purporting to come from his "History of Arianism." We give it as we find it—an insulated extract—we know nothing of the context, or of the counterbalancing expressions which may be found in other parts of the work:—

"In this lies the difference between the treatment due to an individual in error, and to one who is *confident enough* to publish his innovations. The former claims from us the most affectionate sympathy and the most considerate attention: *the latter should meet with no mercy*. He assumes the office of the tempter, and so far forth as his error goes, *must be dealt with by the competent authority as if he were embodied evil*[d]."

"Will the friends of Mr. NEWMAN consent to have the general tenor of his opinions judged of by the apparent meaning of this most un-English, un-Protestant passage—as false in reasoning as it is unfounded in Scripture, and abhorrent to every feeling of humanity? If so we trust that the next Protestant version of PETER DENS will be garnished with parallel passages, to show that a sect exists and flourishes in the Church's favoured university, which advocates the tenets of that worthy personage with so hearty a zeal, as to leave his modest theses and propositions far behind[e]."—*Globe, April* 28.

[d] In the Letter of *Aliquis* above referred to, this quotation will be seen with its accompanying context: see also the same point "elucidated" in the *Specimens of the Theological Teaching of certain Members of the Corpus Committee*.

[e] The party are still at their work in their Tracts for the Times. A more insidious specimen of reasoning is not to be met with, than their recent publication in the Tracts; which is *nominally* against Romanism, but while it gets up a sham fight, really concedes the victory to Popery. Our present defence against Popery, forsooth, is to "keep clear of abstract points and the more sacred subjects." So say these writers.

"There can be no doubt that a large proportion, if not a majority, of those members of convocation who have taken part in the various proceedings against Dr. HAMPDEN, at Oxford, are influenced rather by political than religious zeal. Indeed the party in general does not appear to be very anxious to exculpate itself from such a charge, when we consider the character of the gentleman who has been put forward at the head of the Corpus committee of malcontents. That gentleman's name—and we say it without disparagement to his undoubted talents—is certainly not much circulated at Oxford in in connection with the theological or other studies of the place; but the very sound of it calls up in the minds of most Oxford men, of the present generation, recollections of gowned polemics and angry controversies. His very appearance in the streets of Oxford was usually regarded as the forerunner of meetings, "caucusse," debates, petitions, protests, declarations: like the ominous birds which bring tidings to the quiet islands of the storm coming from seaward:—

> "Quum rauco celeres revolant ex æquore mergi,
> Clamoremque ferunt ad litora."

"But, in the present instance, this gentleman and the other active politicians of the party were but the instruments of others: the true soul of the conspiracy resided in a far more important and powerful class of men, the high orthodox or ultra party of divines in the University. We say more important, because Oxford politics, though noise enough at home, make little impression abroad; but the ecclesiastical opinions inculcated by Oxford instruction are widely diffused throughout the country by means of the younger and more zealous clergy who annually issue from the University. To this class of men (to their credit be it said) the po-

litical delinquencies of Dr. HAMPDEN are matters of very inferior importance. We fear they are glad to make the most of them, inasmuch as they are usefully turned to account in swelling the ranks arrayed in opposition against him; but with them the real object in view in pushing that opposition to its utmost limit is neither the humiliation of a political opponent, nor the condemnation of this or that particular heresy; but it is part of a general and uniform system of policy—to crush, to discourage, to annihilate, if possible, all tendencies to original speculation and free discussion on subjects connected with theology.

"If there be any one peculiarity which, for many years past, has penetrated and characterised the whole system of Oxford instruction in the higher branches of learning, it is *the repression of free opinion.* The direct scope and working of that instruction has been—not to strengthen, to refine, to cultivate the energies of the mind—but to give them a *safe* direction, and cause them to operate within as narrow boundaries as possible. Theology, and its still more dangerous ally moral philosophy, are pursued solely upon this negative principle. If the mind *will* turn its speculative powers in their direction, it is taught to explore them merely as storehouses of argument in defence of established formularies and opinions—to abstain from inquiry, where inquiry may possibly terminate in any other result. No one, who is not well acquainted with the place, knows the extent and the penetrating efficacy of that moral terrorism by which this intellectual tyranny is enforced. Men must have observed, in order to be able to estimate, the effect of the jealous watch kept over the expressions, the conduct, even the very reading of those who have evinced a tendency to independent reasoning—the significant cautioning of friends, the marked displeasure of those in authority, the cautious coldness with which

every effort at free conversation on the part of such persons in generally met; above all, the ceaseless commentary of whispered scandal which is always going the round of the University, and generally has for its subject the conduct and opinions of those whom the majority regard with suspicion. We are not speaking, be it observed, of the younger part of the students; but of the graduate residents who continue at Oxford, for various reasons, after the period of their academical course, and who give to the University its tone and character as a society.

"We are guilty, we are persuaded, of no exaggeration in this picture: nay, we have repeatedly heard this system of intellectual discipline justified and praised, not in all its details, but in its general results, both in Oxford and elsewhere. Religious peace and union, it is said, are the first great objects of academical society. It is not merely desirable to maintain unimpaired the tenets and formularies of the church by subtracting them as far as possible from open discussion: but such discussion is a bad thing in itself which engenders either acrimony and intolerance, or a loose and careless spirit of irreligion. We do not desire, say the Oxford men of the present day, to make theologians or philosophers —our object is the practical education of the heart and conduct. We wish to train men to perform the duties of the ministry with zeal and devotion, and to keep up for the church a supply of undoubting servants. All that an university can seek to accomplish, besides this, is mere matter of ornament and superfluity; and if proficiency in any particular science is injurious to the requisite unanimity and submissiveness, the pursuit of that science ought to be, as far as possible, discouraged.

"Such reasoning might be specious enough, were the human intellect so easily tameable as it presupposes it to be. But the fact is, that this process cannot be

performed without fearfully distorting and perverting it, if it have any original vigour. The good fruit of the Oxford system is at best the maintenance of a tottering orthodoxy; its bad fruits are two wide-spreading evils—ignorance and hypocrisy. We mean that deliberate ignorance, which consists in the wilful refusal to seek truth by the methods of learning and argument. When the student of active and zealous mind, in the commencement of his theological reading, finds the exertions of his intellect, either this way or that way, cramped and discouraged, as soon as ever he has got beyond the very narrow limits marked out by his instructors; when, turn to which ever side he will, he is sure to see the threatening "No thoroughfare" of orthodoxy set up to warn him against further progress, his spirit discouraged and quailing, seeks refuge in wilful ignorance. He endeavours to persuade himself that knowledge is at best a dangerous acquisition: his desire of peace, his hopes and prospects in life, his wish to maintain his place in society, all concur in working upon him to abrogate the exercise of his reason; and he too often satisfies himself that the very natural promptings of his human feelings coincide with the duties of resignation and submissiveness. Hence study, except within a certain and very limited range, is generally abandoned at a very early period by candidates for the ministry in England, and more especially by the Oxford portion of them; and they endeavour to reconcile themselves to the conclusion, that practical zeal in the performance of their duties is all that is required of them, and theology, as a science, either dangerous or superfluous. Hence arises the evident and painful irritation which, every one must have observed, is so often produced, in the mind of an individual thus educated, by the mere introduction of speculative topics in his presence. Conscious of the manner in which his own

faculties of investigation have been thrown away—conscious of his own inability to defend by reasoning the ground which he has taken up on sentiment—he views with a sort of undefined fear all speculations foreign to his own ordinary habits of thought. The late King of Naples used to allege as a reason for not proceeding zealously in the work of unrolling the MSS. of Pompeii, that "he was afraid something would be discovered which might overturn the Christian religion, and then his confessor would be sure to refuse him absolution." Surely the same confusion of ideas prevails in the minds of those who would defend the Creeds and the Articles, by suppressing, as far as possible, all free commentary upon them.

"If such are the results of the Oxford system as to the clergy, what are its consequences to the University as a learned body? Need we say, that theological science at Oxford cannot be said to exist—that theological science, though much and pompously talked about, is in fact pursued without success, because it is not studied with the simple view of attaining the truth; but in order to seek auxiliary arguments in support of dogmas which supersede the necessity of all investigation[d]?"—*Globe, April 29.*

[d] How can this be wondered at when the College Tutors are very commonly young inexperienced men—passing soon after their examination for their Degree into the office of Tutor, and having no time for maturing and improving their acquirements before they commence teachers of others. Thus a perpetual respectable routine of knowledge may be kept up; but what more can be expected?

"While the Oxford host is again about to assemble to proclaim, in full convocation and in full chorus, that their learned and pious Divinity Professor is a fit inmate for the cave of *Giant Pagan*, it is evident to all who mark the course of this controversy (and in many respects it is well worth marking, as a sign of the times) that *Giant Pope* may rightfully claim his property in the professions and principles of the whole party of clerical agitators who have put themselves forward on this occasion.

"'*I know not to what conclusions*,' says the admirable annotator of a *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, a theory like Dr. HAMPDEN's, founded in the belief of the Scriptures, and entire freedom in interpreting them, might lead a rash or intrepid disputant; but I am morally certain, that the slavish doctrines propounded in the Corpus report, would compel every consistent reasoner, who adopted it, to acknowledge an *infallible* church. When we once start on the line of *infallibility*, it is obvious at what goal we must arrive. TENDIMUS IN LATIUM. We may bawl out 'No Popery!' on the road, but we must put up at the Old Lady of Babylon's at last.'

"A most unexpected confirmation of the truth of this sentence will be found in the first number of the *Dublin Review*, a new *Catholic* periodical, which has just come to our hand. This publication is *Liberal* on all points but church dogmas and discipline; and even on those points it is with shame we acknowledge, that we find in it a spirit of forbearance and charity (notwithstanding the inadmissible claims it advances forth in behalf of its church) such as might put to the blush some of our firebrand polemics both in Dublin and London.

"The matter in hand at present is, that the *Dublin Review*, the Irish Catholic organ, and a very able and most sincere one, in an article on *The Oxford Controversy*, understood to be written by Dr. WISEMAN, identifies the pretensions which are now put forth by the Oxford high-fliers with those of the Roman Catholic Church; and having identified, most justly reclaims the *stolen property*. Whether it is prudent in this *Catholic writer* to put forth such pretensions in such times as the present, is his affair, and that of his church. To *us* such pretensions are equally offensive, come they from Oxford or Maynooth! With us, as true *Protestants*, which the Oxford agitators *are not*, to repel and resist such pretensions is a matter of impulse not less than of duty. We enter into no theological controversy; we hope we know our humble office as journalists better. We take our stand on the simple, central, principle of Protestantism, the right of INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENT—the denial of HUMAN INFALLIBILITY. With this watchword—in this age—we must conquer—were Oxford and Maynooth as fully united in effective ecclesiastical force as they *are* in their claims to dogmatic infallibility."

"Those who know best the University of Oxford, will bear witness to the accuracy of the description of its present state which appeared in the columns of the *Globe* last Thursday. The public at large are so little acquainted with the interior of the universities—nay, are so singularly indifferent to inquire—that it might seem desirable to employ those columns occasionally in explaining what is meant by the 'University System;' since, indeed, many are not even aware wherein a college differs from *the university*. At present it is merely proposed to add somewhat to the above-mentioned statements, concerning *the position of parties within the University of Oxford.*

"It is well known that at Cambridge a respectable portion of the resident seniors have long been reckoned as belonging to the class of Evangelical clergy; but at Oxford the Evangelical party never stood high. Individual names were mentioned as of this class, and a considerable proportion of the rising clergy were continually joining it; but of these very few remained in residence after taking their degrees. Thus, whatever parties influenced Convocation, were formed, not on the ground of religious differences, but from other causes which it is irrelevant to mention. The predominant power was that of the old High Church, who followed in the main Hooker's principles of Church and State, and whose maxim was to alter as little as possible the existing order of things, or, if alteration were inevitable, then to consult expediency.

"Some minds, which could not acquiesce in the Evangelical views, were yet much disgusted by the worldliness unfortunately adhering to so many of the high church, and a new set of men began to form. On the appointment of Mr. Canning to be Prime Minister, the Margaret Professor of Divinity, in a public sermon, commented so freely on the consequences, as to give augury, that Oxford would (as under James II.) cease to preach obedience to the temporal power, so soon as that power ceased to rule in conformity with her suggestions. The repeal of the test and corporation acts, the passing of the Catholic emancipation bill, and next the reform bill, in quick succession, have added enormous force to the rising cry, that the Church ought not to be governed by the State, or indeed leave its patronage in the hands of the Crown.

"Thus a *mouvement* party has been formed in Oxford itself, which has secretly discovered Hooker's doctrines to be dangerous, though it is willing to take shelter under his name still. Forgetting, or not knowing, that

the whole basis of the present Church system is the Act of Uniformity, and that this Act was passed not only without leave of the Clergy, but to the ejecting of 2000 Clergymen (and that it received the sanction of the Clergy only after the recusants had been turned out), they pretend that the validity of the existing system depends solely on the Convocation of the Clergy; and this body, which was never more than the King's Ecclesiastical Privy Council, is thus invested by them with legislative power. Strange to say, they also forget that one of the XXXIX. Articles declares that it is unlawful for it to meet without leave of the King. The argument is very specious, that "every Church ought to govern herself; and now that Dissenters have admission to Parliament, it seems a great grievance that Parliament should legislate for the Church; but of course they here forget that the *church property* is the sole ground of this. *If they are willing to renounce the property and the public buildings, they may claim their freedom:* if they like to keep the property, they must not complain. But now that they fear to lean on the State, they are obliged to look out some new ground for holding up their superiority to Dissenters; and this can be nothing but APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION. Such are the plain causes for the recent and surprising spread of this doctrine among the Clergy.

"But let it not be concealed that the real object which the rising sect has in view is, to wrest Church patronage out of the hands of the Crown. The recent outcry against Dr. Hampden is only a first illustration of this. If a parish is discontented with the patron's choice of an incumbent, to leave the parish church they call *rebellion and apostacy from Christ.* But when they themselves dislike the mode in which the Crown bestows its patronage, conscience impels them to resist it to the last. The same principle and the same spirit must lead them;

where they disapprove of the *bishops* nominated by the Crown, to thwart the appointment as far as they are able. This *may* be quite right; but if it be right, *it is right for Church and State to part;* nor ought they to preach insubordination to the State *until they have thrown up the State revenues.*

"Their claim to possess the church property independently of the State is obviously childish to all who have reflected with but ordinary soberness on historical facts. But to some the best practical confutation would be to inquire—Are they prepared to demand a confiscation of the rights of patrons? or is private patronage to be held sacred, and Crown patronage alone to be confiscated? Or, if they mean to demand of Parliament to *buy off* all the patrons, will they after this pretend that the property is not at the disposal of Parliament? And if the existing system of patronage is (by any means) done away, who (but Parliament) is to decide on the interior regulations of the Church which will be needed? As matters stand, there is nothing to decide whether bishops would need to be chosen with popular suffrage, as in the ancient church, or in any other way: whether each bishop should be independent lord of all the property in his diocese, or whether a Synod of bishops should be supreme. In short, a new Church constitution would need to be made; property, power, and rank being at stake, it cannot be believed that the Church *(clerical and lay)* would easily agree among themselves. Obviously, then, it would be most shameful neglect in the civil government to leave them to quarrel.

"It is curious to see the complicated state of their views. Since they found all Church authority upon ordination, they recognise only bishops, priests, and deacons; which indeed is the obvious doctrine of the Church of England. Hence archbishops are avowed

by them to be a mere civil creation, and there is ecclesiastically nothing higher than THE BISHOP. 'The bishop rules all things on earth, as Christ rules all things in heaven,' is the proclamation in the Tracts for the Times. England, then, is regarded by them to have *as many churches as bishoprics*, each bishop being independent. True it is that history reminds us of Henry the Eighth having made new bishoprics, and that the whole is the work of civil power; but this is so long past, that few know or think of it. One recent event (the suppression of Irish bishoprics by Lord Stanley) has most painfully brought into public view a fact which the party would fain conceal. Hence, in a sermon at Oxford, one of the most admired poets of their number spoke against that measure in a paroxysm of distress, the obvious sincerity of which must excite pity that so pious a man should see things through such a veil of delusion. But while in theory they thus cut up the Church of England into numerous subordinate churches, nothing would meet less acceptance with them than a scheme for doing it in reality. Nothing would more annoy them than to see an individual bishop claiming his liberty to dispense with liturgies, alter articles, or *really* wield that power which they nominally attribute to him. They wish to have the bishops *free to do nothing but to rivet men's chains.*

"If in any thing the party is wanting in sincerity, it is in not boldly avowing that all ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTS (in England or Ireland) are Christ's most sacred ministers. For themselves they claim a sacrosanct and awful character, not by virtue of their civil position or enjoyment of Church preferment, but by ordination, by apostolic succession. In their hearts the leaders of the party believe and know that the Romanists stand on the same or higher ground; yet they could not calculate on retaining the allegiance of the body, if they plainly

avowed it.—Besides, it is through Catholic emancipation that they have come into their present danger. They know also, that howsoever *they* may reverence the Catholics, the Catholics will have neither reverence nor mercy for *them*, but will ever treat them as rebels. Hence, despite of their conviction that the Romish priests are sacred persons, they are glad to hear the cry of *No Popery*, and to join in deprecating Romish ascendancy in Ireland. So strangely are men's eyes occasionally enlightened by private interest!

"At present it is to be feared that a majority of the young men at Oxford, who ten years ago would have swelled the ranks of the evangelical clergy, are drawn off by the apostolicals. The latter have many points of apparent superiority. First, there is less of temporizing in them, less calculation of expediency, more apparent magnanimity and fearlessness of consequences, a higher tone concerning the sacred independence of Church authority on the profane legislature, with far greater study of the fathers and display of primitive authoritative tradition. Next, there is a more scrupulous conformity to the rubrics and canons of the Church, and a greater deference to ecclesiastical authority. But, on the other hand, the old evangelicals had an honest hatred of the abuses of the Church, and would have rejoiced to see them cut away by any hand; the new apostolicals *would rather see the country convulsed with civil war, and the government revolutionized*, than allow the State to suppress a single useless canonry. The old party had not the contemptuous and exclusive feeling towards every other body of Christians, which so signalizes the new one. *They* wished to reach men's consciences by truth, and set them free with the liberty which Christ gives his people; but *these* desire nothing short of being father confessors and absolute directors of all men's consciences in the kingdom. It remains to

see whether our rulers will not have wisdom to apply timely checks to so wide spreading and baneful a mischief. Oxford is the seat of the disease, and it is at Oxford that the remedy must be judiciously administered."—*Globe, May 3.*

DR. HAMPDEN'S PERSECUTORS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE GLOBE.

"SIR,—Your paper of Thursday last (April 28) contains a leading article on the revival of the disgraceful proceedings against Dr. Hampden. In that article it is said of the Rev. J. H. Newman, one of the Corpus agitators, that 'a more honest and sincere man is not to be found.' This may be, or it may not be; but if men are to be judged by their actions, and if things are to be called by their right names, it is at least a question upon which a difference of opinion may exist. *Honesty* and *sincerity*, however, afford no valid plea in behalf of persecution. If they did, there is not a deed of blood recorded in the annals of the Inquisition, or in the pages of ecclesiastical history, which will not admit of a similar justification; for what is a persecutor, but one who, presuming himself to be in the right, and taking credit for a *sincere* and *honest* zeal in behalf of God and religion, harasses and destroys those who differ from him in opinion, and avails himself of a power with which the law or superior force has accidentally invested him, for the purpose of visiting others, as *honest* and *sincere* as himself, with deprivation of office, forfeiture of goods, fines, imprisonment, torture, and death?

"I beg utterly to disclaim the intention of imputing to Mr. Newman the least sinister motive in the part which he has thought it his duty to take, as a member

of Convocation, in the late as well as the present proceedings against Dr. Hampden; and address this hasty letter to you simply for the purpose of supplying you with the context of a passage, which is quoted in the last number of the *Edinburgh Review*, from his account of 'The Arians of the fourth Century,' and which you, probably not having the work at hand, have borrowed from that Review, for the purpose of showing in what an odious light an author may be made to appear by insulated extracts from his own writings.

"The passage, which occurs at the close of the 2nd chapter (p. 253), is as follows, with the exception of one trifling omission, which does not at all affect the sense:—

"It has sometimes been said that the Catholics anxiously searched for some offensive test which might operate to the exclusion of the Arians. This is not correct, inasmuch as they HAVE no need to search. Yet, had it been necessary, doubtless it would have been their duty to seek for a test of this nature; nay, to urge upon the heretical teachers the plain consequences of their doctrine, and to drive them into the adoption of them. These consequences are certain of being elicited in the long run; and it is but equitable to anticipate them in the persons of the heresiarchs, rather than to suffer them gradually to unfold and spread far and wide after their day, sapping the faith of their deluded and less guilty followers. Many a man would be deterred from outstepping the truth, could he see the end of his course from the beginning. The Arians felt this, and therefore resisted a detection, which would at once expose them to the condemnation of all serious men. [In this lies the difference between the treatment due to an individual in error, and to one who is confident enough to publish

his innovations. The former claims from us the most affectionate sympathy, and the most considerate attention. The latter should meet with no mercy; he assumes the office of the Tempter, and, so far forth as his error goes, must be dealt with by the competent authority, as if he were embodied evil.] To spare him is a false and dangerous pity. It is to endanger the souls of thousands, and it is uncharitable towards himself."

"The passage in brackets is now no longer insulated; and your readers may judge for themselves, what the advocates of freedom of opinion might expect, if they were left to the tender mercies of the Arian historian, and the parties with which he acts. Dr. Hampden is evidently marked out as their victim. They have searched for an *offensive* test, which may operate to his virtual *exclusion* from the office to which he has been appointed by the Crown. They hold it to be their duty to *urge upon him* what they are pleased to designate *the plain consequences of his doctrine;* nay more, to *drive* him into *the adoption* of them. They deem it only equitable to *anticipate* these consequences *in his own person.* He is not to be regarded simply as *an individual in error.* He has been *confident enough to publish his innovations;* and in so doing, has placed himself beyond the pale of their Christian *sympathy.* He deserves, and must *receive no mercy;* and so far forth as his error goes, must be *dealt with* by the *competent* authority, as if he were *embodied evil.* To spare him were a false and dangerous pity. It were to endanger the souls of thousands. Nay, it were even uncharitable towards himself.

"So said the Catholics of old with regard to every unfortunate heresiarch who fell into their clutches! So say the modern Quasi-Catholics in reference to a

learned and amiable member of their own Church! Will no one interpose, and save these wretched bigots from the consequences of their own folly?

April 30. "Yours, &c. ALIQUIS."

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CLERGY AT CANTERBURY.

TO THE VENERABLE THE ARCHDEACON OF CANTERBURY.

"VENERABLE SIR,—I thank you most sincerely, for the courtesy you showed me from the chair, at the meeting of the clergy, last Tuesday. Nothing but a thorough consciousness of my own integrity of purpose could have emboldened me to appear on that occasion, in defence of Dr. Hampden. The same principle actuates me now to address you publicly as the Archdeacon of this diocese, and, through you, the rest of my brethren. I cannot avoid repeating in substance (which I will do as briefly as possible) the same arguments and protestations I made use of in the National School Room, in presence of yourself and of the clergy; desirous that they should remain on record, in the humble hope of inducing others to suspend their judgment against the much-injured Divinity Professor at Oxford, until they shall have at least, read, and thought, and examined, for themselves.

"I am sorry if any expressions I made use of, on Tuesday, should have been the occasion of offence to any individual present. In the warmth of debate, and advocacy, it is not always possible to be so happy as one could wish, in the choice of words, especially when standing alone, and unsupported, as I then did, against the unanimous sense of a whole meeting. But I must be allowed to repeat, that the clergy have been, in a measure carried away by the 'hue and cry' raised

against Dr. Hampden. This was too evident from the tone of the late meeting. For, amongst thirty or thirty-five assembled clergy, *not one*, was willing to second, or accede to, my two propositions, viz., 'that Dr. H.'s Inaugural Lecture should be read throughout from the chair,' and 'that no one be permitted to sign the proposed address to the Corpus Committee at Oxford, who had not read the Bampton Lectures.' I am fully aware that the former of these publications does not profess to be an answer, or apology, for the latter. But inasmuch as it is the only public and authentic defence of Dr. H.'s, common justice demanded that it should be heard. If there were one gentleman present who had not read it, in its *entire* state, that alone was a sufficient cause for my proposition being acceded to. But what was really the case? Amongst 35 individuals, not above four or five, I may venture to assert, had read that lecture, except in *detailed portions*, either in the newspapers, or in Dr. Pusey's pamphlet of attack; and, with respect to the Bampton Lectures, not above three, at the most, had ever read them in their entire state! Was the meeting, therefore, competent to pronounce upon the merits, or demerits, of Dr. H.'s case, on merely *ex parte* evidence from an opponent? Was it in a fit state calmly and fairly to *discuss* the question of Dr. H.'s soundness or orthodoxy? Certainly not. With such slender grounds for accusation, it could only prejudge and condemn Dr. H., unheard and undefended. And of the number who signed the requisition to you, scarcely a single individual had *then* read any thing on behalf of the accused party. It was asserted, 'that the opinions of 400 members of Convocation at Oxford, including the 70 or 80 resident Heads and Fellows of Colleges, were sufficient to satisfy their minds without hearing any thing from other quarters.' Was this candour, Mr. Archdeacon? Was

this 'to judge righteous judgment?' If *thirty-five* ministers of the gospel could meet together to sign away the public character of one of their brethren, upon the strength merely of what *others* thought and pronounced to be right, without taking the pains to make themselves masters of the case, may it not be fairly presumed that the same summary mode of dealing was adopted by a majority even of the 400 *members of Convocation?* I only demanded common justice for Dr. H. That was denied him. For, when I attempted to read portions from his Inaugural Lecture, I was silenced, and forbidden to proceed. For one sentence, however, I was fortunate enough to obtain a hearing; and, had I been permitted, I could have quoted largely and forcibly from that Christian appeal. One passage I cannot forbear now laying before you, as anticipating so precisely the manner in which Dr. H. has been treated by his opponents:—'I come before you under a cloud of prejudice and clamour, which, however easy for the feeblest among us to raise and diffuse, it is the hardest thing in the world to remove or even diminish. For *one*, who has examined the ground of an objection, there are, at least, *twenty*, who repeat it without examination; for *one*, again, who can comprehend the force of an objection, there are, at least, *twenty*, who never hear the answer; *twenty* who have not power, nor leisure, nor inclination, to attend to, or comprehend, the answer. The evil prejudice, therefore, *goes on multiplying in an increasing ratio, while the means of counteraction are extremely limited.* Amongst all charges, too, the insinuations of heterodoxy, of latitudinarianism, of scepticism, are obviously the most difficult to be removed. They are of so vague a nature, that *each person adapts to them the chimera of his own fears or fancies, and there is no knowing to what point to address a refutation. In fact a refutation is impossible,*

of the ten thousand opinions by which so vague a charge may be interpreted.' Though foiled in my endeavour to obtain a hearing for the Inaugural Lecture, I was thankful to be permitted to read a letter, which I had the honour of receiving from Dr. Hampden[e]. That ought, at least, to have had some weight with the meeting, and to have induced it to suspend its judgment for a time.

"What, then, was the evidence on which the clergy, on Tuesday last, resolved to condemn Dr. Hampden? Two pamphlets by Dr. Pusey, which had been indus-

[e] *The following is the letter referred to from Dr. Hampden.*

"Oxford, March 28, 1836.

"Dear Sir—I beg to thank you cordially for the kind and manly expression of your sentiments to me on this trying occasion. I have suffered acutely, as you will readily suppose. But I have been sustained throughout, under Divine assistance, by a strong consciousness of my own sincerity of faith and attachment to the Church, and by looking forward to the advancement of Scripture-truth, which, I am sure, will ultimately result from the present struggle. It is further highly consolatory to me to know that there are candid spirits, (and I am happy to say, the number of such, even here, has increased) which sympathise with me against this persecution, and have remained uncorrupted by the misrepresentations which have been so importunately sent forth to the public. It is only due to all those who have kindly interested themselves in my cause, to assure them, that the views and sentiments contained in my 'Inaugural Lecture,' truly flowed from my heart, and that they have been my uniform conviction. It is probable, that the attempt to carry the libel-statute (which was thrown out, last Tuesday, by the admirable conduct of the Proctors), or something like it, will be renewed next term. I am very reluctant to call up friends from a distance, though I should, of course, feel their presence here as a great honour to myself, and a support to the cause of free discussion. I do not like, therefore, to refuse your very obliging offer, in the event of a Convocation on the subject being held next term, but I would not press it to your inconvenience.

"I beg to remain, dear Sir,

"Your obliged and faithful servant,

"R. D. HAMPDEN."

"To the Rev. W. S. H. Braham."

triously circulated amongst them: the one, professing to be *impartial* 'Elucidations of Dr. H.'s Theological Statements;' the other, an attempt to prove 'the sentiments contained in his Inaugural Lecture to be *at variance* with his former ones!' All, or most of my brethren, appeared to have attentively studied and perused these, while, with the exception of those above referred to, none had taken the pains, or had the candour, to acquaint themselves with the *entire* works of the Regius Professor! Was not this to condemn *unheard?* was not this to pronounce a verdict on the evidence of *one* side only? Would this be allowable in a court of justice? Would accusations *against* a prisoner, and those principally from *hearsay*, be received by a jury of any twelve men? Would merely his examination before the magistrates, or the account in the public newspapers, or the opinions formed *on report*, be suffered to weigh to his prejudice, when brought before the bar? And shall the clergy, the appointed ministers of peace, forbearance, and charity, be guilty of denying, *to one of their own brethren*, that which is never refused to *the wretched criminal*, the offender of his country's laws? 'Doth our law judge any man, *before it hear him*, and know what he doeth.' (John, vii. 51.)

"I call upon the candid and impartial of my brethren, to read Dr. H.'s 'Bampton Lectures,' accompanied with the Bible—to compare the quotations in the 'Elucidations,' by Dr. Pusey[f], with the original—to read the

[f] Mr. Braham mistakes Mr. Newman's pamphlet of "Elucidations" for the work of Dr. Pusey. Its own author ought surely to bear the disrepute of that publication. And Dr. Pusey has enough to answer for in his own tracts. To form some judgment of Dr. Pusey's unfairness of proceeding, let "The Propositions attributed to Dr. Hampden by Professor Pusey compared with the Text of the Bampton Lectures," be read; and for Mr. Newman's "Elucidations," to see how an Author can be made to appear *sub luce maligna*,

Professor's Inaugural Lecture. I myself have done all this, and more: I have examined into *both* sides of the question. I have read many of the pamphlets and letters that have appeared *pro and con.* My mind is fully satisfied and made up upon the question, that Dr. H. has been unfairly dealt with, and his opinions and principles misunderstood and perverted. If others will do the same, I have no fears for the result. If their objections be not altogether removed, much of their opposition and asperity may be softened. It is, surely, no proof of candour and impartiality to say, that because *many* of the clergy have pronounced Dr. H. unsound and heterodox in his religious sentiments, and consequently unfit for the Professor's chair, that *all,* therefore, must necessarily conclude him to be so. The effect of numbers upon a large body, Dr. H. has himself shown in the quotation above referred to from his Inaugural Lecture. But the cry has gone forth, 'Away with such a fellow from the face of the earth!' And nothing short of the Divine interference, and the hope of Dr. H.'s being able to survive and surmount the tide of opposition against him, will be able to silence that cry. 'Surely the wrath of man shall praise God; the remainder of wrath shall He restrain.'

"I now, Sir, take my leave of the subject. I should have deemed myself a traitor to the cause I advocate, had I not appeared at the meeting, on Tuesday last, boldly to protest against its proceedings. On reviewing my conduct, I feel nothing wherewith to reproach myself. And I still hold to the determination, with the Divine permission and assistance, of repairing to Oxford and tendering my vote in favour of Dr. H. For I should have blushed to espouse a cause, a hundred

Mr. Hull's "Remarks tending to shew how far Dr. Hampden may have been misrepresented, &c." are quite sufficient.

"Oxford, Feb. 13.

"Mr. EDITOR,—The moderated tone in which the Standard, or, more correctly speaking, its Oxford correspondent, returns to the subject of Dr. HAMPDEN's appointment to the vacant chair of Divinity, may not unreasonably be attributed to the growing conviction, that the mode of the original attack has defeated its object, and that the present forlorn hopes of the party depend on the concealment of the rancorous feeling which dictated the article of the 10th inst. Only at the commencement of the present week, we heard of little else than Dr. HAMPDEN's undeniable Socinianism, his utter disqualification on the score of heterodoxy, the profligacy of Lord Melbourne in offering him the appointment, the inutility of any appeal to the minister, the necessity of at once addressing his Majesty, and the anticipated breaking up of the ministry, or, at the very least, the ignominious abandonment of their right of patronage as the condition of their retaining office. With the view of rendering such flattering prospects still more secure, certain of the Heads of Colleges, whose orthodox zeal was only imperfectly appreciated until called forth by the Duke of Wellington's proposal of last spring, kindly consented to bring the matter under the cognizance of the Board of Heads of Houses and Proctors, of course with the ulterior object of laying the petition to the King before Convocation. A Board was summoned by the Vice-Chancellor in consequence, and Dr. H., it is understood, received a hint—doubtless with a view of saving his feelings at the expense of his character and professorship—*not* to attend. Unfortunately for his accusers, he decided on neglecting this advice, and meeting their charges in person. The heterodox passages were produced; but after due consideration, no one was found hardy enough to second the resolution that they bore the character imputed to them, and the Board was compelled to declare *unanimously* that the charge was unsubstantiated. The consequences of this decision have been most important. The petition has become a private affair; and the baffled opponents of Dr. H. have lost the anticipated support of a considerable body of the resident members of the University, whose dislike of Liberalism has not been sufficient to induce them to lend their names to a scandalous and unsupported charge, conceived in a spirit of religious bigotry, and jesuitically aided by a base appeal to the known political sentiments of the majority. Far as Oxford has gone in intolerance, from a sincere, though, we think, a mistaken association of religious and political interests, she still shrinks from fostering within her bosom a sect, which threatens shortly to establish in this place, a worse than papal

tyranny, most fatal to the spirit of Protestantism, and to the social peace of the community.

"Notwithstanding, therefore, the desperate perseverance with which the petition has been hawked from chamber to chamber, by the party of which Professor Pusey is the avowed head, it is believed, that it has been dispatched to Brighton with the signatures of less than half of our residents, and that many who, without having perused Dr. H.'s publications, hastily acquiesced in it on the tempting prospect of embarrassing the Administration, now deeply regret the injustice they have been guilty of, towards the character of a highly respected individual, whose works were never objected to until their author became politically obnoxious, and against whom the charges are ludicrously unsatisfactory and unsustained.

"Yours, Mr. Editor, most obediently,
"OXONIENSIS."

Globe, Feb. 15.

"Oxford, Friday Evening, Feb. 26.

"Mr. EDITOR,—It would be irksome, and perhaps unprofitable, to attempt to supply a contradiction of all the misrepresentations and mis-statements which have thronged the columns of the Standard during the past week; but as in the impression of yesterday it professes an intention of persevering in them, may I beg the favour of your insertion of the following observations and *facts*.

"The statements of the Standard cannot be designed to impose on the residents in Oxford, for it is now perfectly well understood that *here* the party principally opposed to Dr. HAMPDEN, have done their worst, and have failed signally of success. In the first place it is certain that little more than a third of the resident Masters responded to their original call; and that of those a considerable number were not, as the Standard affirms and repeats, 'engaged in instruction in the University;' and, secondly, the names of many might be quoted, who now seriously regret having permitted themselves to assist in a most unfair attack; finally, the publication of a pamphlet entitled *Elucidations*, the inferences of which are as uncharitable as they are palpably illogical, has roused here a spirit of shame and indignation, not unmingled with alarm lest the unscrupulous proceedings of Dr. HAMPDEN's personal enemies should form a precedent for the mode of conducting future controversies.

"It is then, I say, quite evident that the battle has been lost

in Oxford; but the motto of those who dictate such articles as those I have referred to, being

'Flectere si nequeo Superos, Acheronta movebo,'

it may, perhaps, be not unfairly surmised that their appeal is now to those clergymen and other members of Convocation who, residing at a distance from the scene of controversy, are unable to estimate the forlorn prospects of the party in the University.

"In furtherance of this scheme certain scandalous accounts are daily finding their way into some of the provincial journals, and, by way of helping matters, the Standard informs us that on Wednesday last a '*meeting of Doctors and Masters was held, at which certain resolutions were unanimously agreed to;*' at which meeting, Mr. Editor, be it observed, no decision was come to; although on the following day (Thursday) an adjourned meeting was held in the Common room of Corpus College, of which I will furnish you with a few particulars, and leave the public to appreciate the *unanimity* of its promoters.

"The number present was about sixty-five, and two propositions were submitted, one 'to petition the Vice-Chancellor to call a Convocation for the purpose of appointing a Board of Inquiry into Dr. H.'s theological writings;' the other 'for the purpose of petitioning the Bishops to accept, in future, the Margaret Professor's certificate of lectures, instead of the Regius.' The object of these was openly stated to be, not *the protection of the orthodoxy of our academical youth*, but to afford a *handle to the Archbishop of Canterbury for declining to consecrate Dr. H., in the event of Lord Melbourne appointing him to a bishopric.*

"The second of the two resolutions was, after much discussion, finally adopted by a majority of thirty-five to fifteen, or thereabouts. Nearly twenty other individuals, who attended the meeting with no bias in favour of Dr. HAMPDEN, declining to advance further in the matter, and refusing to vote altogether, they asked who was to be Dr. HAMPDEN's accuser —who could render themselves reponsible for the truth of the alleged imputations? A pause ensued, and then came forward the Professor of Hebrew, whose own orthodoxy is seriously questioned, and who, besides, is well known as *personally* hostile to Dr. HAMPDEN, with the declaration that if no one else would, he was willing. Instantly the precise character of the contest flashed on the conviction of every dispassionate person in the room, and the result has been to leave the Vice-Chancellor, an upright and sensible man, at liberty to decline, without discourtesy, to accede to the proposals of a most insignificant minority of the two hundred resident members of

Convocation. Trusting that these particulars will tend materially to counteract the poison circulating through the country, to the infinite detriment of the best interests of our Church;

"I am, Mr. Editor, your most obedient servant,

"OXONIENSIS."

"Saturday Morning.

"I see that the Standard of last evening contains a grossly incorrect account of the meeting of Thursday, and that it has inserted, in addition, a statement of a *petition from* ALL *the Heads of Houses to the Bishops,* which has no foundation either in fact or probability. The Oxford Herald of to-day has no notice of any excitement now existing here—that excitement is wholly in the imagination of the writers of the Standard. O."

"Sunday Evening.

"Postcript to the letter dated *Saturday*.—The two petitions which appear in the Standard of yesterday were *not* agreed to unanimously, as the Standard states. The one dated Feb. 24th, was reconsidered at the Corpus College meeting of Feb. 25th, and was adopted only by a portion of the members of Convocation present. It was finally agreed that *both* petitions should lie for signature until Saturday at ten o'clock.

"Since Thursday they have been taken round to all the Colleges, and have been rejected by a very considerable majority of the College tutors and fellows, who are highly disgusted at the misrepresentations of the feeling of the University daily occurring in certain of the London journals, and are most anxious that the question should cease to be agitated.

"The Signatures are chiefly from Christ Church, Oriel, and Corpus, and whole colleges are protesting against the proceedings of the party—*less than a third* have signed.

"The Vice-Chancellor has so far complied with the wish of the requisitionists, as to summon a Board of Heads of Houses to morrow on the subject. But it is anticipated, that the Board will, in compliance with the *general* feeling, refuse to convene a Convocation in furtherance of a design which, if successful, would have the effect of bringing to Oxford, a number of persons wholly unacquainted with the merits of the case.

"You shall hear to-morrow the result of the meeting of the Board.

"Yours, Mr. Editor, very faithfully,

"OXONIENSIS."

Globe, Feb. 29.

"Oxford, Monday night.

"Mr. EDITOR,—I have the pleasure of informing you that the Board of Heads of Houses this morning exhibited their marked sense of the character of the opposition to Dr. HAMPDEN, by REJECTING the two requisitions by a majority of *eighteen to six*[f], and *sixteen to eight*, respectively. I have no time to add more than that I am, Mr. Editor,

"Yours, most obediently,
"OXONIENSIS."

Globe, March 1.

"Oxford, Wednesday Evening, March 9.

"Mr. EDITOR—I am sorry to inform you that the anti-Hampden party are still unceasing in their endeavours to promote their dangerous views at the expense of the religious peace and harmony of the University, and that they are daily exhibiting more and more of reckless disregard of the wishes of constituted authorities, as repeatedly and emphatically expressed in their recent decisions.

"On Friday last the Board peremptorily resolved on postponing the question as to the expediency of calling a Convocation for the 'purpose of addressing the Bishops against Dr. HAMPDEN,' until after the latter should have delivered his 'Inaugural Lecture,' advertised for the 17th instant. And this resolution so incensed the Corpus junta, as to call forth the menacing manifesto which the Standard quoted with such unaffected admiration on Monday. This manifesto was signed on behalf of the meeting by the Chairman, Mr. Vaughan Thomas—a useful expedient for concealing the increasing falling-off of their numbers.

"It will scarcely be believed that the Board of Heads sacrificed their authority by taking this violent document into their consideration at their hebdomadal meeting on Monday, rescinding their resolution of postponement, and re-opening the question. It is true, that they adjourned until Wednesday without taking any further steps—but not with impunity. Their rigid taskmasters of Corpus assembled on Tuesday, and administered the following stimulus—a kind of ultimatum upon an ultimatum—in which the Heads are mercifully warned that they may yet redeem themselves from the 'imperium in imperio' with which they are threatened:

[f] To state it more correctly, by 20 to 4—the minority of four, being Dr. Routh, Dr. Foulkes, Dr. Jenkyns, and Dr. Gilbert.

"'OXFORD, March 8, 1836.—At an adjourned meeting of members of Convocation held this day in Corpus Common Room, the committee appointed on Saturday last to draw up propositions out of Dr. HAMPDEN's works, *and a final measure* to be submitted to the meeting, reported progress, and requested to be allowed further time, till Thursday next, when they should be prepared to lay before the meeting the final result of their deliberations in its complete form.

"'Upon which it was moved and seconded, and carried unanimously,—

"'That the meeting do adjourn till Thursday, the 10th inst., at two o'clock, at Corpus, then to receive the final report of the *measure now in preparation* by the committee.

(Signed) "'VAUGHAN THOMAS, B. D., Chairman.'"

"Yesterday the Board again met, and I am happy to say that they still hesitate to sacrifice their duty and their independence to this dictation. They have again adjourned until Friday, and to-morrow we shall hear of 'the final measure' of the Corpus College party. That it will be of violent import few can doubt; but if the Board act as it is yet anticipated, it will merit the thanks of the University, by withholding its sanction from the misconstructions, which have been so industriously circulated through the country by Dr. HAMPDEN's antagonists.

"Time alone is necessary, to enable the Professor to vindicate his hitherto undisputed religious character from the effect of misapprehension—or, at all events, he is entitled to a hearing; and those who may condemn most unqualifiedly the sentiments attributed to him, must either suspend their judgment respecting him, or be prepared to have meted to them the same measure which they uncharitably mete to others. This is the general feeling, I rejoice to say, of our residents; and if they are scarcely generous enough to come forward on behalf of a political enemy, they are far too just and upright not to approve of his being allowed a fair trial. I appeal fearlessly to the most zealous champions of orthodoxy; whether they would think themselves treated with due candour, if from their *own* works passages were selected, and exhibited in an isolated form in their bare literal meaning, unillustrated to the reader by a view of the writer's object, or his context. Surely, then, the Board of Heads will not consent to place Dr. HAMPDEN's character, and that of the University, the one in temporary, the other in lasting jeopardy, by adopting the proposition now before them, to summon a Convocation of those who know his works but from extracts, and who will not await a fair discussion. Should they be guilty of such weakness, it will be for our Proctors to protect the honour of the University by interposing their veto, and saving the non-resident members

of our body from an act, which, as religious men and friends of the Church, they must ultimately regret.

"Yours, Mr. Editor, most obediently,

"OXONIENSIS."

"P. S. Thursday morning.—The general opinion to-day seems to be that the Board will, at is next meeting, finally reject the renewed proposition for a Convocation. The article in the Standard of last night has its foundation in the wishes of the writer. Perhaps the sanguine character of the anticipator may be in some degree explained by the fact, that, throughout the business, the party opposed to Dr. H. have been relatively stronger at the Board than amongst the resident Masters. No intelligence of the transactions at Corpus to-day has yet transpired." *Globe, March* 11.

Friday Evening, March 11.

"Mr. Editor,—The Corpus party have at length, by unparalleled perseverance, and the most exaggerated estimate of their strength, succeeded in intimidating the waverers in the Board of Heads of Houses, into a surrender of their better judgment, and of the privileges which they have often exercised to the advantage of the University, but on which, now that they have once yielded to clamour, their taskmasters will not allow them much longer to pique themselves. Opinions are much divided as to how far this practical change in the constitution of the University will prove beneficial or injurious; but for the present, it is certainly to be lamented, as it involves us, as a body, in the imputation of having consented to pass judgment on a writer whose works have been read by few, understood by fewer, and condemned on *ex parte* representations by the majority of those who are arrayed against him.

"The precise nature of the measure to be introduced into Convocation on Saturday the 19th instant is, 'To suspend, during the pleasure of the Academical body, the privilege of the Regius Professor to form one of the select board for appointing University preachers, and examining into the opinions expressed in the University pulpit."

"Whether this was the 'final measure' emphatically threatened by the Corpus party or not, we can hardly conjecture, as no manifesto was yesterday issued by that rival power. At all events the latter ought to congratulate itself on its success, as the proposition of the Board affords them an opportunity of realizing their plan, and strengthening their position by a reinforcement of country voters. The only modification of the

original proposition, which the friends of fair play have been enabled to obtain, is the postponement of the Convocation until two days after the Inaugural Lecture will have been delivered. In this there is an admission of the principle, that we should hear before we condemn, at the same time that the interval allowed is utterly inadequate to give it efficiency. Yet we cannot blame the principal section of the Corpus party in this respect, at least its leaders;—they honestly and sincerely declare that no explanation would satisfy *them*—and delay could therefore only have the effect of depriving them of supporters. Their political followers will, of course, be awakened in due time, but too late, possibly, they may find that they have lent themselves to a plan of which they know nothing as yet, but of which the public may form a conception from the following extract from the published works of one of the most active and zealous of the sect. To me it appears to aim at a realization of the old doctrine of 'the State a part of the Church;' and if it be so, let the political enemies of Dr. Hampden look well, before they advance further in the course they are pursuing:—

"'Then (the period of Athanasius) *as now*, there was the prospect, and partly the presence in the Church, of an heretical power, enthraling it, exerting a varied influence *and a usurped claim to the appointment of her functionaries*, and interfering with the management of her internal affairs. . . . . Meanwhile we may take comfort in reflecting that, though the *present tyranny has more of insult*, it has hitherto had less of scandal, than attended the ascendancy of Arianism: we may rejoice in the piety, prudence, and varied graces of our spiritual rulers, and may rest in the confidence that, should the hand of Satan press us sore, our Athanasius and Basil will be given us in their destined season, to break the bonds of the oppressors, and to let the captives go free'."—*History of Arians*, p. 422, published 1833.

"I have no time for further comment, and remain, Mr. Editor, your most obedient servant,

"Oxoniensis."

Globe, March 12.

Oxford, Thursday morning.

"Mr. Editor.—The warfare, which has for the last month degraded our University, continues, I lament to say, with unabated fury. Mr. Lancaster, of Queen's College, and another gentleman, who by a strange misnomer entitles himself "Misopseudes," have each favoured us with the effusions of their charity and their truth: and to-day Professor Pusey has

given to the world a sweet and sacred thing, which I hope will be read, if it be only for the exquisite dissimulation of personal ill-will which pervades his preface. I think I cannot do Professor Hampden a greater service than by making an extract from this precious document, and furnishing an illustration of it from the work to which it refers, in juxta-position with the corresponding passage in the Bampton Lectures:—

"'The right fear of overstating or colouring the views of Dr. Hampden, appears to have led the author of the 'Elucidations' rather to understate them: passages might be selected from the writings of Dr. Hampden, carrying with them a more decided condemnation than the *mild* author of the 'Elucidations' could allow himself to pass.'—*Pusey's Preface.*

"Now, Mr. Editor, pray insert the following extracts from the 'Elucidations,' for the benefit of honest men:—

"'As to the doctrine of the Trinity, Dr. H. holds that Scripture contains certain phenomena concerning the dealings of God with man, which, when compared together, are remarkable and startling: but what the mystery is, or that it is the very mystery which *the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity expresses*, is, he considers, *not revealed.*'

"'The passage which he quotes in illustration of this statement, is as follows; and I place it with the *unmutilated* passage of the Bampton Lectures, in parallel columns; humbly submitting to honest Christians, that, *mild* as the Elucidations or their author may be, there is something treacherous about both one and the other:—

Extract in the Elucidations.	*Bampton Lectures*, 3. p. 146.
"'No man can be more convinced than I am that there is a mystery of God revealed in the Christian dispensation, and that no scheme of Unitarianism can solve the whole of the phenomena which Scripture records; but I am also fully sensible that there is a mystery attached to the subject which is not a mystery of God.'	"'The truth itself of the Trinitarian doctrine emerges from these mists of human speculation, like the bold naked land on which an atmosphere of fog has for a time rested. No man can be more convinced than I am, etc. etc.'

"I should be sorry to insult any man's understanding by commenting on this.—And am, Mr. Editor, yours faithfully,

"OXONIENSIS."

"P. S. The *Standard* account of the decision of the Archbishops and Bishops respecting Dr. Hampden, is pure invention; but, as it will, of course, never be contradicted, will

doubtless answer its purpose of misleading the exclusive readers of that journal.

"P. S. Perhaps Professor Pusey means '*half* stating,' by '*understating*.'

"The '*Inaugural Lecture*' to-day has made a deep impression; its piety, feeling, simplicity, and unvarnished truths, are indescribably convincing."

Globe, March 18.

"Oxford, March 20.

"Mr. Editor.—The '*authorized*' statement in the *Standard* of last evening, that the Proctors of the University 'have not put their veto' on the Statute intended to be proposed in Convocation on Tuesday, is *literally* true, but it is no less certain that the Vice-Chancellor received from them an intimation yesterday morning, of their having decided on doing so at the proper time—which is, on the first reading of the Statute to Convocation on Tuesday. It is also certain, that they have during the last week repeatedly stated their determination to take this course, and that the measure of the Corpus party for bringing members of Convocation to Oxford from distant quarters, have been taken under the knowledge of this resolution of the Proctors, perhaps with the hope of shaking their firmness, and intimidating them by what Dr. Hampden has well described as 'the array of hostile numbers.' Are we to interpret the announcement in the *Standard*, as part of the same unscrupulous pursuit of a desired object? It could scarcely be deemed unfair to conjecture thus much, if we review the whole conduct of the party since they commenced their trade of agitation.

"It is well known, that a religious party has made its appearance in Oxford within the last five years, contemptible in point of numbers, but formidable from their organization and systematic perseverance. The leading tenets of this section of the Establishment are, an inordinately high estimate of Church authority, a depreciation of Scripture as a rule of faith, and a vehement desire for the restoration of the ancient ecclesiastical discipline. Hitherto, however, they have worked in secret, and were known only by the occasional delivery of a heterodox sermon in the University pulpit, and the publication of an extraordinary periodical, entitled 'Tracts for the Times,' to which Professor Pusey, and the author of the 'Elucidations,' have been principal contributors. The agitation of the 'declaration question,' last spring, encouraged this party to make an effort to advance their peculiar views,

and Dr. Hampden was singled out as a victim to be offered on the altar of intolerance. Certain pamphlets forthwith appeared reflecting on his "Observations on Dissent;" but the anxiously looked-for moment had been too fondly anticipated, the sluggish orthodoxy of the University still slumbered. It will be understood what a God-send Lord Melbourne's nomination of Dr. H. to the Divinity Chair must have been deemed, and not unreasonably. Witness the herd of politicians who have combined to express their hitherto unheard-of horror of latitudinarian divines, and their hitherto unsuspected attachment to primitive discipline. So convinced, too, are they of the goodness of their cause, and of the utter indefensibility of Dr. H.'s case, that they make it a matter of conscience not to allow others to judge for themselves, perhaps to spare them that superfluous task. With pious zeal they have hastened to condemn, and thinks it presumptuous in others to demand time for examination and reflection. To be sure the statements of the 'Elucidations' have been demolished in every Common-room in Oxford, except in Oriel and Corpus; but then have not the party since declared, that although the Elucidations might do well to gull country gentlemen, as an appendix to the *British Magazine*, that on the other hand 'no explanation of insulated passages' could vindicate Dr. H., though they might conveniently prove his guilt. 'The Gallios of this world,' as Professor Pusey terms them, may think there is unfairness in this; but it is only 'earnestness,' earnestness for the faith, a Christian desire to prevent mischief at any expense, at the expense of the grossest injustice to an individual, and the most grievous misrepresentation of his views. Alas, that the unchristian world will not appreciate such devotion, *will* feel that it was not right to send off copies of resolutions and canvassing letters on the very eve of the delivery of the Inaugural Lecture, that it was not decent for the accusers to absent themselves from the recital of the defence, and that the Proctors, by the course they have resolved upon, will merit the approval of every lover of fair play, and every real friend of the character of the University!

"Yours, Mr. Editor, most faithfully,—

"OXONIENSIS."

Globe, March 21.

"Oxford, Monday night.

"Mr. Editor,—The Corpus '*board*' held their '*hebdomadal*' meeting this morning, but it has not yet transpired, whether they have resolved on any measure as a substitute for that

which is destined to receive its quietus to-morrow from the veto of the Proctors. It is, however, understood, that the leaders of the cabal have carefully abstained from letting their friends know that their journey will be an unprofitable one, and that they have even up to the present moment encouraged the belief that the Proctors were undecided, although there is not a member of the University, resident, who is not perfectly well aware, that these gentlemen *formally announced their determination of stopping this disgraceful proceeding, to the Vice-Chancellor, as long ago as Saturday morning.* Many of these unfortunate travellers will to-morrow complain of having been misled; and the *onus will be laid, as far as such an imposition is practicable, on the heads of the Proctors.* Meanwhile, the friends of Dr. Hampden have communicated to those members of Convocation who had expressed a wish to come hither in support of him, the certainty of the Statute being suppressed; and accordingly, Mr. Pusey's friends will have matters all to themselves. Perhaps they will console themselves by holding a Covocation at Corpus, and concluding with burning Dr. Hampden in effigy.

"Yours, Mr. Editor, most faithfully,

"OXONIENSIS."

Globe, March 22.

"Oxford Wednesday evening.

"Mr. Editor,—I have no doubt that I shall have much comment to make on the next Oxford report which reaches us in the columns of the *Standard*, touching the late proceedings in Oxford; which have terminated as was fully predicted, and not as was anticipated by the same ingenious print, which within three weeks has informed its readers, that 'all the Heads of Houses had petitioned the Bishops'—that 'the Bishops had resolved on not demanding from candidates for ordination Dr. Hampden's certificate'—and 'that the Proctors had not decided on placing their veto on the recent proceedings.'

"Omitting all detail at present of what occurred in the theatre yesterday, I now beg to inform you that the defeated party, to the number of about three hundred and fifty, assembled immediately afterwards in the common room of Brazen-nose, under the auspices of that 'tower of strength,' Lord Kenyon; and that, after an inflammatory harangue, couched in terms infinitely flattering to the Proctors, and of a strong political character, by Mr. Trevor, member for Durham, the following amiable declaration was agreed to by those of the members

present, who did not feel the same disgust as did many at the deceptions which have been practised on them, and the whole spirit of the transaction :—

"'We, the undersigned, non-resident members of Convocation, who have come to this place for the purpose of taking part in the deliberation on the proposed Statute respecting Dr. Hampden, desire also to express our feelings of admiration and gratitude towards *the great body of resident members*, and especially towards the members of the Committee which has prepared the several documents circulated at this crisis, for the wisdom and energy, the *Christian zeal* and *Christian charity*, with which they have laboured in this painful but sacred cause: and we do hereby pledge ourselves to promote here and elsewhere, according to our means, the efficacy of the protest which the University is now called upon to enter against a false and dangerous system of Theology, as also to render that protest, if possible, more solemn, complete, and decisive for any temporary obstruction which may occur, through advantage taken of the forms of our academical constitution.'

"I have no time to add more than that the declaration would have been complete if it added *common honesty* to Christian zeal and Christian charity, and not assumed that the great body of resident members viewed with anything but alarm and distrust the violence which has been exhibited.

"Yours, Mr. Editor, most faithfully,
"OXONIENSIS."

Globe, March 24.

"Oxford, March 25th.

"Mr. Editor—The exasperated feeling exhibited towards the Proctors by very many of the non-resident members, on their quitting the theatre on Tuesday last, must have originated in an entire misconception of the motives which influenced the conduct of those functionaries; and it is to be hoped that, when the real state of the case is represented to them, those who joined in the indecent clamour with which Messrs. Bayly and Reynolds were assailed, and permitted themselves to be guilty of yells and shouts of disapprobation, will feel how seriously and groundlessly they have compromised the dignity of Convocation by their conduct.

"If, as the *Standard* asserts, a great proportion of the Convocation were anxious to express an opinion 'dictated by judgment and principle, and not by local cabal,' surely they should have possessed themselves of the real grounds on which the Proctors had decided to act, rather than have lent them-

selves without inquiry to the representations of the Corpus body.

It is well known in this place that the Proctors have uniformly protested against the whole of the proceedings against Dr. Hampden, as at once *precipitate* and *unstatutable*; that at an early period they had intimated the probability of their taking the course which they finally adopted, and that their determination to suspend at least the passing of the proposed Statute, was arrived at, not in defiance of the mature opinion of the body whose votes were appealed to, but under an apprehension that, had they not interposed, the University might afterwards have had occasion to regret a step, which they conscientiously felt would, on due reflection, appear at once unjust, and detrimental to the very interests which it was their duty to protect.

Should his Majesty's government view matters in the same light as they are regarded here by many not unacquainted with the nature of our academical constitution, and an inquiry be directed, in consequence, into the tenure and extent of our privileges, perhaps the University may hereafter have to congratulate itself on the manly and consistent resistance which has been, in this instance, offered to a suspected infringement of the prerogative of the Crown. (Vide Declaration of James the First, prefixed to the Articles.) Yours, Mr. Editor, most faithfully,

"OXONIENSIS."

Globe, March 26.

Oxford, Saturday Night.

"Mr. Editor.—Have the kindness to insert the following, in contradiction of the last batch of inventions which has appeared in the columns of the *Standard*:—Instead of upwards of 600, not more than 500 members of Convocation were present in the theatre on Tuesday last; and of these the *residents* constituted less than a third. Several supporters of Dr. Hampden have quitted Oxford for the vacation, under the certainty of the veto being exercised; this will leave about 300 for the number of the non-residents who visited Oxford on the occasion; of these not more than 20 were of Dr. H.'s party, as great pains had been taken to prevent as many as possible from undertaking a useless journey. We may, therefore, calculate 300, or thereabouts, to have been the number of those whom the misrepresentations of Dr. Hampden's opinions and works, together with the most urgent private and public appeals, could collect, out of nearly 1,400 to whom the Corpus party admit having addressed their circulars.

"Next, as to the division in the theatre: It is true an attempt at one time was made, by the agitators withdrawing to the west side of the theatre, and they succeeded in leaving a body of Dr. H.'s supporters, amounting to perhaps 35, on the east side; but as the latter had no intention of dividing, of course it is mere assumption to say, that those who were thus isolated constituted the whole of their party; in fact, myself and several others were stationed on the west side throughout the proceedings, and it is unquestionable that there were at least in all 70 or 80 present, who, had the votes been taken, would have voted for the Professor—a great number, considering the previous certainty that the proceedings would be stopped *in limine*. Perhaps the unwarrantable character of the assumption that the University generally is favourable to the views of the Corpus party, may derive illustration from the fact, that out of eleven resident Professors *two* only, out of seven Public Examiners *one* only, and of the Public Tutors scarcely *half*, have appended their names to the declaration. I have no time to add more than the above, which I should think could not be contradicted, were it not that past experience proves that falsification is the familiar weapon of the correspondents of the *Standard*.

"Yours, Mr. Editor, most faithfully,

Globe, March 28. "OXONIENSIS."

TO THE NON-RESIDENT MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

"GENTLEMEN,—You have each of you, within the last week, received a circular, containing an intimation of the renewal of the penal Statute of last term affecting the Regius Professor.

"That the proposed measure will receive the sanction of Convocation, the 'cloud of prejudice and clamour' under which the Regius Professor is now labouring, does not permit me to doubt. But feeling that the policy of the Corpus leaders has been throughout, to induce numbers, who were ignorant of the merits of the case, to commit themselves on the principle 'vestigia nulla retrorsum,' I am anxious, by a few remarks on their circular, to counteract, as much as possible, the evil which its profession of purity and disinterested zeal, apart from its dogmatic temper and the imperfection of its statements, is calculated to produce.

"In the first clause it is assumed that the signatures of nearly four hundred members *assembled at Oxford* were at-

tached to the address presented to the Vice-Chancellor; if I am not very greatly mistaken, many of the signatures are those of persons who were *not present* on the occasion referred to.

"This, however, is a trifling consideration; it must be confessed that the baseless calumnies and abominable libels which, on the strength of Mr. Newman's 'Elucidations,' were fabricated in the *Standard*, and which it was his Christian duty to have contradicted, did induce a very considerable number of clergymen to assemble for the purpose of marking their sense of the supposed impropriety of Lord Melbourne's appointment. Many of these, however, had their eyes effectually opened by the virulence displayed in the Convocation House, and afterwards in the hall of Brazen-nose College, and will certainly absent themselves altogether from the approaching miserable scene of University degradation. Of the third clause it is difficult to speak with becoming patience. Neither 'private or political' animosity has, to my knowledge, (and I have seen most of what has appeared on both sides the question) been attributed to the *whole* body of 'Christian ministers and educated men' who prefixed their name to the declaration of last term; and I, for one, would readily bear my testimony to the purity of the motives which have actuated many in lending themselves to the persecution of Dr. Hampden. But I might appeal to the common sense of any man, whether the fact of some of the leaders of the Corpus party having before been *in personal collision* with Dr. Hampden, was not calculated to engender a suspicion that they might unconsciously have been influenced by the recollection of former feuds. And I might as safely appeal to the general opinion of dispassionate men, that a considerable number of the declarationists adopted the hue and cry, without investigation, on the impulse of political animosity. The remainder of the clause involves a severe reflection on some members of the party opposed to the Professor. The feeling of private friendship has been actually put forth, so as to add weight to charges subversive of his reputation. I will not believe that such was the intention; it was done, no doubt, in attestation of their sincerity; but it should have been avoided.

"Me Capitolinus convictore usus amico
A puero est, causâque meâ permulta rogatus
Fecit; et incolumi lætor quod vivit in urbe.
Sed tamen admiror, quo pacto judicium illud
Fugerit."

"I might add, that delicacy of sentiment would have suggested a refraining from 'expressions of private kindness'

under circumstances in which, though kind regrets might have been entertained, they must bitterly have aggravated Dr. Hampden's feelings.

"The committee proceed to state that they 'on a former occasion felt it their duty to lay before the non-resident members, a general view of the nature of those errors, *not garbled, but condensed*, and exhibited on *their own responsibility*.'

"On this, too, an observation is necessary; that at the meeting of Heads of Houses on Monday last, the unfair and garbled character of these statements was fully admitted, even by those members of the Board, who would not see that the admission implies that they were promoting an appeal to a deceived public. And Dr. Cardwell in particular, the proposer of the Statute, repudiated the idea of being a disciple of the Pusey school. If members of Convocation wish for confirmation of what is asserted, of the utter unfairness of the statements, I beg to direct them to two pamphlets recently published by Fellowes, one by Mr. Hull, of Lincoln's Inn, the other consisting of a comparison of Dr. Pusey's statements, with the 'genuine unmutilated text of the Bampton lectures:' they will see that it is not what, by a figure of speech, they are pleased to style 'the doubtful importance of particular passages,' but the uniform misrepresentation of the author's meaning which is complained of.

"Moreoever the committee circulated these statements *in the name of eighty individuals*, many of whom deny having authorized the committee to make that use of them. It is too late for the committee now, when the mischief has been done, to commit the rashness of taking the responsibility on themselves; and it is idle to talk of addresses from the clergy, and eminent signatures, the result of their now adopted misrepresentation, and the echo of their own roar. But, say they, 'In opposition to this body of evidence,' no one has 'come forward *with his name*.'

"Truly it would be Quixotic in any man to come forward with his name, where the '*fortiter calumniare*' is so well understood, and to sacrifice his chances of usefulness as a clergyman, by incurring the imputation of Atheism, or Deism, or Socinianism, at the hands of those organs of orthodoxy, the *Standard* and *John Bull* newspapers.

"Again—'The question was always felt to be one which could not legitimately be affected by any explanation whatever.'

"By whom? By the resident members of the University generally? That I meet by an unqualified denial. By the members of the committee? Will Mr. Sewell answer the question?

"Again—'No imputation has been thrown on Dr. Hampden's personal belief.'

"What means Mr. Newman by speaking of 'a private opinion which he has of Dr. H.'s work?'

"What mean the declarationists by '*abstaining from imputing personal disbelief?*' Methinks it were no great abstinence to abstain from what is not suspected or insinuated to exist.

"And now I come to a point on which I agree with the committee; an abandonment of the measure would have implied an acknowledgment of error. Would to heaven, that instead of perseverance in a course on every account to be lamented, they had chosen that better part. Let them not flatter themselves that they can, by the plan they contemplate, restore tranquillity to the University. Let them not think that a man who has within two weeks been anew cruelly calumniated and injured, will remain passive under the infliction of a public censure.

"A forbearance corresponding to the fair words which close the circular must be exhibited by its authors, and a tone less dogmatic must be assumed in judging one, whom the voice of the University has in happier times pronouuced to be their superior in reasoning, in judging, and in talent; as he is clearly now in the Christian meekness and patience with which he has borne their attacks.

"Unless Mr. Thomas and his companions adopt this course, I am so far from expecting any early repose to our agitated society, that—

"δέδοικα μᾶλλον μὴ, καὶ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτὸν ὑπολίπωμεν.

"OXONIENSIS."

"Oxford, Saturday night."

Globe, May 2.

"Mr. Editor,—The persecutors of the Regius Professor of Divinity have at length succeeded, if not as fully as their ambition might lead them to hope, at least as fatally as the worst enemies of the Church and the University could desire. The passing of the proposed Statute to-day has consummated a proceeding of the most flagrant and unprecedented injustice, and will effectually remove any impression, which might hitherto have existed in the public mind, of any moral value in University opinion. The numbers on a division appeared 474 to 94. The theatre on this occasion was open only to Masters of Arts; the Undergratuates having so strangely confounded Dr. Hampden with Dr. Pusey on the last occasion, as to take

the latter for the delinquent, and to visit him with their disapprobation, instead of the 'obnoxious individual,' as the Corpus writers in the *Standard* style him. Ladies also were the first time excluded, as a kind of practical protest against any sympathy with the recent decision of the House of Commons on Mr. Grantley Berkeley's motion. Some excellent speeches were delivered on the side of Dr. Hampden by Dr. Twisleton of New College, Mr. Philip Duncan, the Warden of Merton, and Mr. Rowlandson of Queen's [g]. The first of these gentlemen was considerably hissed by the reverend and orthodox friends of the Corpus committee. On the other side, Professor Keble was listened to with that respect which it well became the defenders of decency and justice to render him; and Mr. Miller was permited also to fulminate his anathemas on the devoted head of the anti-papal Professor with impunity.

"The proceedings were interrupted once or twice by a mass of excluded Undergraduates who burst open the theatre doors, and who, having been appealed to a year or two since, when it suited the Seniors to halloo them on to the discomfiture of the Dissenters, will not, it seems, consent to resign their charter and abandon their right to join in our deliberations.

"During the proceedings, the accompanying notice [h] was circulated in the body of the theatre; so that the members of Convocation cannot complain of any legal proceedings which may affect their academic privileges hereafter. A copy of the opinion was, it is said, forwarded to the Vice-Chancellor last evening; and report further states that he declined communicating it to the Board of Heads this morning. How far this may be the case I cannot say, but, at all events, it is unquestionable that the 474 have acted with their eyes open, and that they have afforded the government an opportunity of interference which they would not be justified in neglecting. It is consolatory to think, however, that the good sense of the country clergy is returning, and that, notwithstanding the two thousand circulars which have been distributed, accompanied by the most pressing and earnest entreaties, not 400 have responded to the call, out of the 600, who, if the *Standard* and *Oxford Herald* are to be believed, were present on the last occasion—while the supporters of Dr. Hampden, which the same authority stated at 36, have, without solicitation, increased to 94.

"I cannot now add more than that the Convocation closed

[g] The name of Mr. Way, who spoke most energetically against the whole proceeding, should have been added to the list.

[h] The opinion of the Attorney-General and Dr. Lushington against the legality of the Statute.

with the announcement of the numbers by the Proctors, and a shout of triumph on the part of Mr. Nathaniel Goldsmid and the enchanted Corpusites—responded to from without by the groans of the disappointed Undergraduates, who marked their not unnatural contempt for their dispassionate seniors by breaking the windows of the theatre, and by an assault on the Proctor, that gentleman having previously become obnoxious by a vain attempt to restore the now nearly obsolete academical costume.

"Yours, Mr. Editor, in great haste,
"OXONIENSIS."

"P. S. I should observe that a considerable number of resident members declined voting—the lay professors amongst the number; eleven Heads of Houses out of twenty-three, and three out of the four Public Examiners were among the supporters of the Professor of Divinity. No pains were spared by his opponents to bring up voters, but the Inaugural Lecture has had its weight. There is honesty in the face of it. So, notwithstanding the repeated solicitations, and *letters upon letters* which have been addressed to members of Convocation, the account was beggarly. Is it indifference to Christianity, or to Popery, that we must attribute all this?"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WILTSHIRE HERALD.

"Sir,—There occurs in your columns of last week, an attack upon Dr. Hampden, as being 'not a Trinitarian believer.' I am aware you took it from the *Standard*, and I am sure you will, with your usual candour, give a conspicuous place in your paper to the following extracts from his 'Bampton Lectures'—*the work which is alleged to prove the charge*:—'I firmly and devoutly believe that word which has declared the name of *the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*,'—page 150. In page 387, Dr. H. speaks of "*the mercies of the Atonement*;' and in a pamphlet, published by him since the Lectures, and entitled 'Observations on Religious Dissent,' amongst other passages, occurs the following:—'As believers in a *real Atonement* for sin, we may justly feel shocked at the thought which imputes any merit to man, and regard as a sinful pride in ourselves the absence of that self abasement in the sight of God, which is peculiarly impressed upon us by

this Holy truth,'—page 26. 'The fact of the Atonement surely none but one possessing *the witness of the Spirit* could declare,'—page 18. And he proceeds to convict Unitarianism of a fundamental fallacy.

"If the originator of this calumny knew the contents of Dr. H.'s writings (which he was bound to do), and also is in possession of orthodox principles, does he not afford one more proof that exactness of profession may consist with an utter want of that 'faith which worketh by love,' thereby involuntarily confirming the spirit and tenor of those writings, which he brands with the charge of falsehood.

"How very different from such a spirit is the object Dr. H. professes to have in view, viz.—'to inculcate candour, forbearance, a charitable construction of the views of others, a humble and teachable disposition towards God,'—Lect. p. 391. And he appeals to time, that great test of truth, to show that there is in his assertions nothing inconsistent with the firmest adhesion to the Church of England, nothing tending to heresy, or empty generalisation of Scripture truth.' — Postscript to the Observations, page 11.

"How far this is the case, it is not for me to give an opinion—my motive has been to perform an act of friendship and duty, by rebutting a calumny, and by endeavouring to obtain for one, whom I know to be a true Christian man, a Christian hearing.

"I remain, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"A CURATE."

Salisbury and Wilts. Herald, Feb. 20.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE WILTS. HERALD.

"Sir,—I see in your last paper a notice of the *Standard*, as containing extracts from Dr. Hampden's works in proof of his heterodoxy. There are three classes of persons who join in the attack upon him. Some are his mere political enemies, because he advo-

cated a relaxation of the University laws, so as to admit persons born and bred Dissenters, provided they were willing to make a certain declaration previous to matriculation, and to conform to the Church discipline of the place. This class of persons are the lovers of exclusiveness in Church and State, simply, and without reference to the interests of religion as such. Some, principally from what they *hear*, or read in newspapers, consisting of garbled extracts and strong denunciations, being themselves free from political bias, are sincerely alarmed for the cause of orthodox religion. A third class, and perhaps more numerous than either of the former, consists of those who are actuated by political and religious feelings combined. It is to the second class of your readers alone that I address myself. First came, the *Morning Post:* 'A newspaper,' it commenced, 'is not the place for discussing orthodoxy.' After sundry grave and solemn remarks, it nevertheless cited two passages from the Bampton Lectures in proof of Dr. Hampden's disbelief of the Atonement—a doctrine which (as I proved in my last) Dr. H. holds as 'a *real* atonement,' and as a '*blessed truth.*'

"To give these quotations would necessarily lead me into too long a discussion for the occasion. Suffice it to say, such a mode of treatment might easily be applied to prove every one of our most valued divines heretical. And even the *Morning Post* '*fully admits that there is much of explanation and qualification to be collected from other parts of Dr. H.'s writings.*" And it ends with saying, 'We cannot expect, *nor have we attempted*, to lead our readers into any consideration of the theological merits of this controversy!!'

"Let this example of consistency, candour, and justice, serve as a specimen of the attacks made on Dr. H. through the newspaper press.

"Next came the *Standard*, to which your last *Herald* alludes. I have not been able to get hold of that paper. I hope it was more successful in its quotations. All I can say is, let the question be decided in the fair field of legitimate controversy. It will be time enough then to brand Dr. H. as heretical. This, however, has not yet been done, nor, I believe, attempted. If Dr. H. is to

be believed, (and the virtues of his private character, his adversaries expressly admit, together with his learning and talent,) no one can be more heartily attached to the great doctrines of Christianity, to which he affectionately clings as purifying and consoling the heart; no one more firm and true to the Church of England, which he declares he 'loves and admires.' (Observations, p. *22.*)

His great object, to be gathered from his works, is to produce a real union of hearts among Christians, especially Protestant Christians, and to this end to get rid of all cumbrous niceties of logical doctrines from expressions adopted by uninspired men, in matters universally acknowledged to be above human reason; which fallacious subtleties have always crowded the complicated fabric of the Roman Catholic Church; have adhered in some measure to the purer formularies of the reformed Church; and ever have led, and ever must lead (in proportion to the degree in which they exist) to dissension and persecution, infidelity, and all its consequences. His object, therefore, is to place the Church of England upon the most pure and impregnable basis, by conciliating without compromise those who conscientiously dissent from her, to render all that belong to her, her members on conviction, and to advance the great cause of true and practical religion. One fault Dr. H. certainly has; he appears to write only for those who have both attainments, and candour, and leisure, to make themselves fully acquainted with his writings. And, it must be confessed, his style leans towards obscurity. The great and formidable title applied to him is 'Latitudinarian.' Allow me, therefore, to conclude with some remarks on this term by Robinson, in his Theological Dictionary, —a work universally received and valued, I believe, in the orthodox world: "The chief leaders of these Latitudinarians were Hales and Chillingworth; but More, Cudworth, Gale, Whichcot, and Tillotson, were also among the number. *These men were firmly attached to the Church of England.* They reduced the fundamental articles of Christianity to a few points, and endeavoured to show contending parties, that they had no reason to oppose each other with such animosity and

bitterness. They met however with much opposition, *and were branded as Atheists and Deists by some, and as Socinians by others.*"

"I remain, sir,
"Your obliged and obedient,
"A CURATE,
"(And Member of Convocation)."

Wilts. Herald, March 12.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"Nor judge by a statute a believer's hope."—COWPER.

"SIR,—It is demanded of me, though the most humble of individuals, to come forward in behalf of a misunderstood, misrepresented, and injured man.

"I am the eldest son of, I believe, the only tutor Dr. Hampden ever had previously to his entering the University, but who died some years since. He left, however, in his family more than one heart warmly alive to the fact, more than one mouth ready at all times to testify it, that by young Hampden's exemplary and, humanly speaking, perfect purity of morals, by his affectionate heart and amiable deportment, by his rare and extraordinary gratitude, proved from the first day to the last by solid facts, and lastly and principally, by his fervent and holy, though chaste and retiring piety (in proof of which I could adduce affecting traits); he conciliated the warmest love and most unbounded esteem of both my parents, and left on their minds an impression of profound veneration for his character. This man I am now required to vote unfit to teach true religion—that is, to pronounce a disgrace to the University of which he is the brightest ornament, and to the Church of which he is a sound and faithful member. I am required to believe that one who was holy and exemplary as a youth, and has ever been so as a Clergyman, and in all the relations of life is, notwithstanding, a perverter of truth, a teacher of scepticism, and a propagator of unbelief!

"He acknowledges in his Inaugural Lecture that he

may sometimes have expressed himself in a manner liable to mistake, and he has in that lecture, so far as its very limited compass would allow, taken all pains to correct it. But if these are sufficient grounds for censure and degradation, surely it will apply to many more of our most valuable divines, nay, even to the inspired apostle, who wrote 'many things hard to be understood, and whcih they that are unstable and unlearned' or, I may add, uncandid or indolent, 'do wrest' and pervert from their general and main drift, from their true and just meaning. I assert, and could unanswerably prove, that many of the younger clergy—some of whom had been recently indebted to Dr. H. as an examiner for a certificate of competent attainments for a degree, and who were brought up to judge him by means hasty, indecent, unfair, and in their consequences irreparably pernicious, were in my own knowledge both 'unstable and unlearned;' and I humble ask whether the boisterous violence betrayed on Tuesday last in the theatre by an assemblage of Clergymen, in the act of passing what ought to be to them at least a painful censure upon a Christian of acknowledged amiableness of character, was not a sufficient evidence that such weighty and momentous causes ought not to come for decision before such youthful and inexperienced minds; which, on first entering the Church, are usually swollen with the pride of exclusive orthodoxy, are full of texts, articles, and arguments, and fierce in defence of their tenets against all assailants, actual or fancied.

"In conclusion, I would humbly ask the older, more grave, more decent, more pure minded of those who on that day were, doubtless painfully to their own feelings, mixed up with the frantic throng, whether they, in their consciences, thought that the true religion, the practical piety, the charity, the spiritual interests of these teachers of 'peace on earth,' and through them, of the community, were likely to be promoted by that day's support, as they believed it, of Orthodoxy.

"I am, Sir, your obedient humble servant,

"A MEMBER OF CONVOCATION,"

"(and late a Fellow in the University of Oxford.)"

"North Bradley, March 25."

"P. S. As regards my description as late Fellow, I beg to say I was Michel Fellow of Queen's College in 1825."

"SIR,—The impression naturally conveyed by the letter of 'AMICUS ECCLESIÆ,' in your last, is that by advocating the fair hearing of Dr. Hampden, I, 'in my Christian, if not in my ministerial character,' have forgotten what is due to my Master, 'for whom I ought to forsake all,' from a mere 'generous' feeling towards a man—and that though I deserve censure, yet this circumstance of the generosity 'disarms censure of its sting.' I repudiate the bribe—I deny the inference, and do not fear the censure.

"If the deepest learning joined with the most fervent and consistent piety from boyhood, and the most exemplary conduct in life, can entitle any man to be heard with respect, then it is not just that the writings of the Regius Professor should be idly condemned under the vague taunt of 'philosophizing speculations,'—by which language an appeal is made, whether designedly or not, to the weakness of pious but partially-informed Christians, who are by such means induced, to raise the cry of 'philosophy and vain deceits,' spurious liberality, and so forth, against men who seek to render the soundest learning instrumental to the most genuine piety. Such men as Burnet, Tillotson, and even Heber, *(credite posteri!)* have all suffered in their day.

"The avowed object of Dr. H., in his works, is, by the improvement of what is of acknowledged human workmanship in the Church, to promote peace, union, and charity, in a community distracted with divisions. And until, instead of petty pamphlets full of garbled statements and ingenious deceptions, we have the question decided in the wide field of full and legitimate controversy, that these works *are* mere 'philosophising speculations,' I shall continue, in the name, and not by the desertion of my Master, who is the God of truth, to appeal 'from an excited spirit to a spirit of soberness and candour,' and to 'demand that he be tried, not by

the decisions of an adverse school, but by the calm and gentle reason of men disposed to give him credit for no less love of the truth and the faith than themselves, and who will contend with him by argument, not by *censure* and intimidation.' Has 'AMICUS ECCLESIÆ' read that beautiful composition from which this passage is taken, the Inaugural Lecture? Of course he has. I ask him, are its contents 'philosophizing speculations?'. No; he dare not call them any but the most glowing effusions of deep and manly piety, combined with the soundest orthodoxy. Either, then, Dr. H. is no philosophizing speculator, or he is a gross hypocrite, or thirdly, his opinions have suddenly changed. If either of the two latter alternatives are true, let some facts be adduced in proof of it. Till they are so adduced, I give Dr. Hampden credit for his assertions, and advocate his writings.

"I am glad to find "AMICUS ECCLESIÆ' condemns the Oxford Tracts. Yet he says my letter has done nothing for my friend. Now, if it is a fact that the principal adversaries of my friend were concerned with these tracts, which tracts are to be condemned, it surely ought to do something for him to draw public attention to this state of the case. If 'AMICUS' has correctly answered for the whole community (which of course I cannot doubt he is entitled to do), it may perhaps be owing to some unwillingness in the mind to hear anything in behalf of a heretic. Or, perhaps, which is more likely, my letter did nothing for my friend *with him;* which is the more to be lamented, since my great object was to induce persons interested in the present controversy to read on both sides of the question.

"As to the 'Hibernicism' of my lively monitor, I must acknowledge that, when the sacred cause of justice and the interest of the whole community were concerned, I for the moment forgot the question of the interests of our University; but, perhaps, after all, I may not have done 'less than nothing' for it, if my efforts, feeble though they be, shall have contributed to redeem it from a party too powerful in it, which has lately led others, endued with no leaning towards Romanism in general, to join in an endeavour to work the righteousness of God by the wrath and violence of man; and by an act

to which ten eminent Heads of the first Colleges were strongly opposed.

"Lastly,—since 'AMICUS ECCLESIÆ' has recourse himself to a common and agreeable disguise, he knows, no doubt, how painful it is to find one's-self morally compelled to obtrude one's name upon the public.

"I remain, Sir,

"Your obliged and obedient,

"E. ROWLANDSON."

"Kington, May 24, 1836."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DORSET COUNTY CHRONICLE.

"Sir,—It appears to me from the Journal which I now take the liberty of sending you, and which I received yesterday by Post, from an anonymous Correspondent, that Dr. Hampden is not exactly *such a person,* as you seem to apprehend is about to be thrust on the Church. I would only add to this catalogue of facts my testimony from an intimate acquaintance with Dr. H., that his mind is not more imbued with learning, than with a spirit of the soundest, and the most ardent Christian piety; and that his conduct and character are faithfully indicative of such a mind—not only irreproachable, but exemplary in all the religious, and social relations of life. This I think has been admitted by some of his most active enemies, on the present occasion.

"It is said that for one of the many honours which have marked his splendid career in the University, in most of which be it observed, he has encountered a formidable competition, there were more than forty candidates; and that he was not amongst the number. I heard this fact at Oxford, and it may in some measure account for the spirit which has been excited against him in that place, and particularly amongst the junior members of Convocation. Much of the prejudice prevailing elsewhere may no doubt be ascribed to the circumstance of his having derived patronage from a Government notorious for its hostility, or at least for

its recklessness of consequences, to the security and ascendancy of a Protestant Establishment.

"I would hazard a conjecture that few, or none, of those, whom you represent as so impatient to rise up in judgment against Dr. H., have read any portion of his Bampton Lectures, but the garbled statements which have appeared in the St. James's Chronicle, or in those 'Elucidations,' which have been published for the express purpose of condemning him. If any one, after an unprejudiced perusal of these lectures, can characterize their author as a *Socinian*, we may, without a breach of charity, say of him, what is predicated, with sacred truth, of the Man who has said in his heart there is no God.

"I am, Sir,

"Your humble Servant, and with perfect sincerity,

"ANTI-SOCINUS."

"March, 10th."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DORSET COUNTY CHRONICLE.

"Sir,—Finding that a wish has been expressed by some, or *by one* of the Clergy of Dorset, to present an Address to the Throne, condemnatory of Dr. Hampden's principles, and deprecating their baleful influence, I beg, through the medium of your impartial and popular Journal, to suggest one or two points for consideration. Whether it would be wise, in us to pronounce sentence in a case which remains undecided at Oxford, the great arena of the contest, the very scene of its origin and progress, to its present stage of suspense? Whether it would be just to condemn the accused, without a fair hearing? How many of us have read the Bampton Lectures, which seem so recently to have provoked animadversion in the University, where they were delivered two years ago[1]?

"We are referred to a Pamphlet containing '*Elucidations*' of Dr. H.'s Theology, which no doubt are very

[1] Four years ago—in 1832.

plausible, and *may* be very just; but do we not in general require statements, and not commentaries from a witness? Are we not accustomed, to receive the testimony of an adversary, cum grano, or with a little more caution than is here proposed?

"Do we not expect a witness, however unexceptionable to speak the whole truth? Such has hitherto been the practice of this country. In the public administration of justice, shall we, my reverend and very worthy brother, be the first to depart from it? We, who I trust, not only recognize in theory, but exemplify in practice, a much higher law, in 'judging our Christian Brother!'

"Let Dr. H., that arch enemy of creeds and articles, pastors, flocks, and fleeces, (at least in the imagination of my Rev. Brother,) defend his principles as a Theologian, while I am bound both in Charity and in Justice, to say of the man, what he cannot say for himself, that he is not more distinguished as a Scholar, than he is estimable for the genuine piety, and virtues of the Christian.

"I am, Sir,

"Your very obedient and humble Servant,

"A CLERGYMAN of the Church of England."

"March, 14."

OXFORD: PRINTED BY TALBOYS AND BROWNE.

ELUCIDATIONS

OF

DR. HAMPDEN'S

THEOLOGICAL STATEMENTS.

OXFORD,
PRINTED BY W. BAXTER.
SOLD BY J. H. PARKER; AND BY MESSRS. RIVINGTON,
LONDON.
1836.

ELUCIDATIONS,

&c.

It may be fairly asked of any resident of this place, who at this time directs attention to Dr. Hampden's works, why he has not done so in the considerable interval which has elapsed since their publication. The present writer's plain answer to this demand would be, that he had hoped to have been spared the necessity of an invidious task which pertained more to others than to himself; to those who were less connected by College ties with the Author in question. He felt that he had no call of office or station that way, and that he could not put himself forward without an apology for so doing. Even now he cannot persuade himself to put his name in the title-page, though he makes no secret of it to those who choose to enquire.

At the present juncture, many persons are asking each other, and trying to determine for themselves, what the theological views of Dr. Hampden precisely are. It is much to be regretted they did not turn their thoughts to this matter sooner, especially considering the call made on them last Spring to do so.

The omission, however, must be attributed, in addition to other causes, to the particular form and character of his Lectures, and the condensed and abstract style which their extent of subject may have rendered necessary.

The consideration of these peculiarities has given rise to the following pages, in which it is not attempted to contravene any of Dr. Hampden's positions, but to exhibit them, as far as he has stated them, and that with as much fairness as may be attainable by one who has his own opinion about them. This attempt may perchance assist the judgments of those who are in doubt as to his doctrines, and may explain the earnestness of those who condemn them.

1. *Concerning Doctrinal Truths.*

Here first it is necessary to explain Dr. H.'s views concerning Theological Statements.

He considers that the only belief necessary for a Christian, as such, is belief that the Scripture is the word of God; that no statement whatever, even though correctly deduced from the text of Scripture, is part of the revelation; that no right conclusions about theological truth can be drawn from Scripture; that Scripture itself is a mere record of historical facts; that it contains no dogmatic statements, such as those about the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, Justification, &c.; that theological statements, though natural and unavoidable, are in all cases but human opinions; that even the juxtaposition of the actual sentences of Scripture, is a human deduction; that an individual is not abstractedly the worse for being a Unitarian; that it does not follow that another is worse because I should be worse for being so; that, though a deduction be correct, logical, and true, yet a denial of it must not be pronounced to be more than an error of judgment; that infinite theories may be formed about the text of Scripture, but that they ought not to be made of public importance to Christian communities, badges of fellowship, reasons for separation, and the like; that the Articles of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds are merely human opinions, scholastic, allowing of change,

unwarrantable when imposed, and, in fact, the produce of a mistaken philosophy; and that the Apostles' Creed is defensible only when considered as a record of historical facts.

"1. Whilst we agree in the canon of Scripture, in the very words for the most part from which we learn what are the objects of faith, we suffer disunion to spread among us, through the various interpretations suggested by our own reasonings on the admitted facts of Scripture. We introduce theories of the Divine Being and attributes, theories of human nature and of the universe, principles drawn from the various branches of human philosophy, into the body itself of revealed wisdom."—Observ. p. 7.

"In religion, properly so called, few Christians, if any—I speak of course of pious minds—really differ. All acknowledge with nearly unanimous assent, I believe, the great original facts of the Bible. . . When I look at the reception by the Unitarians both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of divine facts the name of Christians."—Observ. p. 19.

"No conclusions of human reasoning, however correctly deduced, however logically sound, are properly religious truths, or such as strictly and necessarily belong to human salvation through Christ."—Observ. p. 8.

"Pious opinions, it must be observed, are not parts of revelation."—Observ. p. 14.

"2. The whole revelation contained in them [our Scriptures], so far as it is revelation, consists of *matter of fact*."—Observ. p. 13.

"I do not mean that no right conclusions whatever result from the truths of Scripture: but I confine the assertion to intellectual, or speculative, or theological truth, as distinct from moral."—Observ. p. 12.

"I shall only briefly touch here on a fundamental characteristic of the Christian Scriptures, which totally precludes all deduction of speculative conclusions concerning religious truth."—Observ. p. 13.

"Strictly to speak, in the Scripture itself there are no doctrines. What we read there is matter of fact: either fact nakedly set forth as it occurred, or fact explained and elucidated by the light of inspiration cast upon it. . . . . If any part of Scripture contains *doctrinal* statements, it will at any rate be supposed to be the epistolary. But even this part, if accurately considered, will not be found an exception. . . . . Let the inveterate idea that the Epistles are the doctrinal portion of Scripture, be for awhile banished from the mind; . . . for my part, I cannot doubt but that the decision will be in favour of the *practical* character of them. The speculating theologian will perhaps answer by adducing text after text from an Epistle, in which he will contend that some dogmatic truth . . . . is asserted. But "what is the chaff to the wheat?" I appeal, from the logical criticism of the Apostle's words to their apostolical spirit, from Paul philosophizing to Paul preaching, and entreating, and persuading. And I ask, whether it is likely that an Apostle would have adopted the form of an epistolary communication for imparting mysterious propositions to disciples with whom he enjoyed the opportunity of personal intercourse; and to whom he had already "declared the whole counsel of God;" whether in preaching Christ he would have used a method of communicating truth, which implies some scientific application of language, an analysis at least of propositions into their terms, in order to its being rightly understood?" B. L. p. 374.

"Pious opinions, indeed, we may form; it is hardly possible practically to avoid exercising the mind in reasoning and speculating on the given truths of Scripture. Such indeed are the doctrinal statements of our Articles. I may wish there were

less of dogmatism in them. Still I cannot but approve them for the piety that pervades them."—Observ. p. 14.

"There can be no rational doubt that man is in a degraded disadvantageous condition, that Jesus Christ came into the world in the mercy of God to produce a restoration of man, that He brought life and immortality to light by His coming, that He died on the cross for our sins, and rose again for our justification, that the Holy Ghost came by his promise to abide with His Church, miraculously assisting the Apostles in the first institution of it, and ever since that period interceding with the hearts of believers. These and other truths connected with them are not collected merely from *texts* or *sentences* of Scripture, they are parts of its records. Infinite theories" [that is, it would appear, such as the doctrines of the Trinity, Incarnation, Atonement, &c.] "may be raised upon them; but these theories, whether true or false, leave the facts where they were."—B. L. p. 390.

3. "Dogmas of Theology then, *as such*, are human authorities. But do I mean to say by this, that they are unimportant to religion, or that they are essentially wrong, foreign to true religion, and inconsistent with it? I wish rather to establish their importance and proper truth, as distinct from the honour and verity of the simple Divine Word."—B. L. p. 375.

4. "The collection itself of scriptural expressions into one body of statement amounts to a human exposition of the doctrine. An artificial construction is given to them, which they have not in the Scripture itself," &c.—Observ. p. 10.

5. "Other communions are not necessarily in error or heresy, because we hold them to be so; but viewing their opinions as erroneous, we must guard against them, as feeling that we should ourselves be heretical and profane, if we should change and adopt such opinions. For example, as believers in a real Atonement for sin, &c. Thus again to a Trinitarian, &c."—*Vide infra*. Observ. p. 26.

6. "Opinions on religious matters are regarded as identical with the objects of faith; and the zeal which belongs to dissentients in the latter, is transferred to the guiltless differences of fallible judgments."—Observ. p. 7.

7. "In truth, I say, it [theological opinion] ought not to exist. Theological opinion, as necessarily mixed up with speculative knowledge, ought not to be the bond of union of any Christian society, or a mark of discrimination between Christian and Christian."—Observ. p. 21.

"If I can establish this point [that no conclusions of human reasoning, however correctly deduced, are properly religious truths, &c. *vid. supra*], it will be seen in great measure how far a conscientious and zealous earnestness for "the faith once delivered to the saints" justifies our sectarian animosities and our party exclusions."—Observ. p. 18.

8. "If it be admitted that the notions on which their [the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds'] several expressions are founded, are both unphilosophical and unscriptural; it must be remembered, that they do not impress those notions on the faith of the Christian, as matters of affirmative belief. They only use the terms of ancient theories of philosophy, theories current in the schools at the time when they were written, to exclude others *more obviously* (sic) injurious to the simplicity of the Faith."—B. L. p. 378.

"I do not presume to say that alteration is actually required. I am merely addressing myself to the general question, as to the capacity of improvement in Church Creeds and Articles, with the view of suggesting a right theory of the subject. To deny the essential variableness of such documents, is to admit an human authority to a parity with the authority of Inspiration."—B. L. p. 381.

"The Apostles' Creed states nothing but facts. The transition is immense from this to the scholastic speculations involved in the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds. Both these last, indeed, are logical definitions of the high subject of

which they treat, differing from each other only in point of comprehensiveness and exactness."—B. L. p. 544.

"We then proceed to contend for these unrevealed representations of the wisdom of God, as if it were that very wisdom as it stands forth confessed in His own living oracles. 'The wisdom that is from above' is at once 'pure' and 'gentle.' Surely it has no resemblance to that dogmatical and sententious wisdom which theological controversy has created."—Observ. p. 8.

Remarks on the above.

Article VI. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, *nor may be proved thereby*, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought *requisite or necessary to salvation.*" On the other hand, Dr. H. says, "*No conclusions of human reasoning*, however correctly deduced, ... are properly religious truths, or such as strictly and necessarily *belong to human salvation* through Christ."

On this Dr. H. observes, that "it by no means follows, that what can be *proved out of Scripture* must *therefore* be truth of revelation."

He accounts for the clause in the Article, by alleging the intention of our Reformers thereby to prevent "the inroads of tradition or any human authority."

He then urges against himself the objection, that "a truth of Scripture cannot be stated otherwise than in the form of a *conclusion* from Scripture." He replies, that though it be expressed in Scripture language,

it is still a human exposition of the doctrine, and that he thinks the employing technical terms preferable to employing terms of Scripture. Vid. Observ. p. 8—10.

So far Dr. H. brings forward and disposes of objections to his doctrine. But there is still a desideratum in his statement. Language such as he has used, is frequent in the mouths of Socinians and others. These religionists urge, after his manner, that all doctrine is matter of opinion, varying according to the character of individual minds. We wait for him then to complete his view, and to draw the line between himself and them, lest Churchmen perchance who listen to him, turn Socinians before he is aware of their danger. He says, that it is a matter of opinion, whether a man believe in the Divinity of Christ or not. Now, supposing hearers of his were to take up with Socinianism, would he be *earnest* in reclaiming them or not? If he was earnest, which one should expect, would not this imply that he *did* think it a difference whether or not a man were a Socinian; and would he not, in the present imperfect development of his views, expose himself to the retort, "Trinitarianism, belief in the Atonement, &c., are necessary for you, but not for us: do not judge us, we can be humble-minded without them, we believe the facts of Scripture," &c.? This is not here urged as an *objection* to his views, which are not sufficiently brought out to enable us formally to judge of them on this point, but by way of comparing them with those of others "whose theology he strongly dislikes," and showing our claim on him for an *explanation*. A particular theory is common

to him and certain Socinians; *where* and *how* does he part company with them?

With a view of illustrating this point, it may be well to quote the words of one who, starting from the very theory maintained by Dr. Hampden, has recently become a convert to Socinianism. Had the writer of these pages that author's works at hand, he might quote still more apposite passages.

"You must frequently have observed the hopelessness of the attempts which are constantly made to establish various points of Christian doctrine by logical arguments, founded on detached texts of Scripture. You must have seen regular collections of passages, selected with the utmost patience, and arranged into classes with the greatest ingenuity. Most works on controversial divinity are attempts of this kind to draw some abstract proposition as the unquestionable result of the various expressions of Scripture upon the given subject. You cannot but have observed, moreover, how short all such attempts fall of the intended object," &c.—*Mr. Blanco White on Heresy.*

"As we cannot approach the objective truth of such convictions [*i. e.* of things beyond the reach of our senses] beyond or out of our intellect, all our moral duties to truth, (where moral duties are concerned, as is the case with religious truths,) are due to the only truth we can reach, i. e. the conviction of our own minds. But it is here that the fatal mistake takes place. The pride of the religious enthusiast takes up his subjective truth as the divine objective truth itself. On other subjects, if contradiction made him angry and impatient, he would be more or less ashamed of showing it. Not so in the present case. He indulges his most violent passions under the character of zeal for God and His truth; his natural desire of ruling over others appears in

the shape of a vehement concern in the preservation of the assent of the mass of the people to the orthodox, i. e. his own opinions. Because he is sure he is right, he positively denies that those who contradict him *can be* sure they are right, &c."—*Mr. Blanco White, Law of Libel.*

Or take again the parallel words of Hoadley, who died indeed in the communion, nay, in the high places, of our Church, yet on the present Bishop of London's authority[a], must be considered a Socinian.

"Though many persons may mistake in their different apprehensions concerning the sense of these words," [those in which the faith was once delivered,] "yet we may be sure, *whilst we retain these words*, that we retain what *God himself has seen fit should be delivered* and transmitted to us as the best conveyance, all things considered, of the faith required of us. This I mean particularly with regard to those articles of belief which are properly Christian. . . . . By contending for the faith as it was once delivered to the saints in the New Testament, we shall only press upon men the *receiving what it has pleased God to deliver*, but shall avoid a great evil of enforcing upon them the *consequences* which we ourselves see, or think we see, to follow from the doctrines first delivered. . . . . The just consequences from any truth are certainly equally true with that truth from which they follow; and it is as certain that to him who sees them to follow, or thinks he sees them, they are as truths, and may justly be maintained as such. But they are not so to others who see them not in the same light. Nor can they be made necessary to be believed by others, till those others themselves discover their relation to the primitive truths of Religion."—Sermon on Contending for the Faith, vol. iii. p. 714.

[a] Answer to Butler, p. 31.

2. *Doctrine of the Trinity.*

As to the doctrine of the Trinity, Dr. H. holds that Scripture contains certain phenomena concerning the dealings of the Supreme Being with man, which, when compared together, are remarkable and startling, and irresistibly force upon the mind that there is *some* mystery in the divine nature; but what that mystery is, or that it is the very mystery which the catholic doctrine of the Trinity expresses, is, he considers, not revealed. The catholic doctrine is one out of the infinite theories which may be raised upon the facts of Scripture, and the Athanasian Creed is in its origin the view of a party in the church. Again: it is not scriptural or necessary to insist upon the numerical or real unity of the Supreme Being; since He is not revealed as one in Himself, but as one contrasted with the gods of polytheism. On the whole, that it is an abuse of Scripture to attempt thus to deduce a theology at all, i. e. a knowledge of God in respect of His nature, attributes, &c.

1. "One fact is clear through all this labyrinth of variations which theological creeds have exhibited; that there is some extraordinary communication concerning the Divine Being, in those Scriptural notices of God, which have called forth the curiosity of thinking men in all ages. To me it matters little what opinion on the subject has been prior, has been advocated by the shrewdest wit or deepest learning, has been most popular, most extensive in its reception. All differences

of this kind belong to the history of the human mind, as much as to theology, and affect not the broad basement of fact on which the manifold forms of speculation have taken their rise. The only ancient, only catholic truth is the scriptural fact. Let us hold that fast in its depth and breadth . . . and we can neither be Sabellians, or Tritheists, or Socinians."—B. L. p. 149.

"Historically regarded, they [Dr. H.'s discussions] evidence the reality of those sacred facts of Divine Providence, which we comprehensively denote by the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity. But let us not identify this reality with the theories couched under a logical phraseology. I firmly and devoutly believe that word, which has declared the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. But who can pretend to that exactness of thought on the subject, on which our technical language is based?"—B. L. p. 150.

2. "When I look at the reception by the Unitarians both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those who acknowledge this basis of divine facts, the name of Christians."—Observ. p. 20.

"Thus, again, to the Trinitarian, the consequences of rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity must consistently be regarded as dangerous. But he has no right to extend his anathema beyond himself to one who has unhappily not embraced the same view of Scripture truth."—Observ. p. 27.

3. "It appears to me that the silence respecting the individual author" [of the Athanasian Creed] "was designed, or at least his name was forgotten, in the wish to give a higher authority to the document; and that its reception by us in its present form . . . . is an evidence of the triumph of a party in the Church, thus declaring their authoritative judgment under the sanction of a name, which expressed in itself every thing hostile to Arianism."—B. L. p. 105.

4. "No one can be more convinced than I am, that there is a

real mystery of God revealed in the Christian dispensation; and that no scheme of Unitarianism can solve the whole of the phenomena which Scripture records. But I am also as fully sensible, that there is a mystery attached to the subject, which is not a mystery of God. Take, for instance, the notion of the Divine Unity. We are apt to conceive that the Unity must be understood numerically; that we may reason from the notion of Unity to the properties of the Divine Being. But is this a just notion of the Unity of God? .... Surely the revelation of the Divine Unity was not meant to convey to Israel any speculative notion of the oneness of the Deity, but practically to influence their minds in regard to the superstitions from which they had been brought out..... Now were this view of the revelation of the Divine Unity strictly maintained, would it not greatly abate the repugnance often felt at the admission of a Trinity in Unity? .... To deny a Trinity would then be felt the same as to assert that, because polytheism was false, therefore no new manifestation of God, not resulting from the negation of polytheism, can be true."—B. L. p. 146.

5. "To the Christian speculator, under such a method" [the scholastic], "these principles would of course be sought no where else but in the Divine Being himself... His nature and attributes, so far as they were explained by the light of reason or revealed by the illumination of Scripture, would alone present to the inquirer that immobility and eternity, and absolute priority of truth, of which he was in quest."—B. L. p. 78.

"Its [the scholastic system's] principles... were to be drawn from the nature of the Divine Being, as the only sure ground on which a divine and universal philosophy could fix its first steps."—B. L. p. 79.

"If now we regard the Scriptures in the way of the Schoolmen, as having God for their proper subject, instead of reading them as a divine history of man, we naturally neglect the analogies of time and circumstances. The immutability

of the Divine Being, in the contemplation of whom we are then exclusively engaged, is the prevailing object of our inquiry. Our business is to collect into one theory every scattered intimation of the Divine Being and attributes. If, on the contrary, we take the nature and condition of man under Divine Providence as the great subject of our sacred books, we are as naturally led to study the facts recorded in the Scripture in their real historical place," &c.—B. L. p. 89.

"Eager to erect their theology into a philosophy of the Divine Being, they were comparatively indifferent to the humbler truths which lay in the walk of man's every-day life." —B. L. p. 93.

"The scholastic philosophy had for its basis a theoretic knowledge of the Divine Being; a knowledge of God as the highest cause of all things, the primary being in the order of the universe." [It is added in a note,] "Thus, too, not only in the decrees of the Council of Trent, but in our own Articles, the doctrines on this head occupy the first place . . . The Fathers of the Church of England, even in shaking off the spiritual bonds of Rome, were tacitly influenced by the discipline in which their minds had been trained."—B. L. p. 99.

Remarks on the above.

It will be seen from the foregoing passages that Dr. H. considers the doctrine of the Trinity, as held by himself, to be but one out of the infinite theories which might be formed from the facts of the Scripture revelation. Now it is not here denied that men of subtle minds may be able to combine this scepticism of the intellect with devotion of the heart to the Ever-Blessed Trinity; but will men of common understand-

ings, if provided with no explanation or limitation of this view, be able to say in faith, " O Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity, three Persons, one God, have mercy, &c?" or "To whom [Christ] with the Father and the Holy Ghost, be &c?" or " Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith; which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly: *and the Catholic Faith is this, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity?*" Here then we demand some *explanation* for the sake of Dr. H.'s hearers and readers.

Let it not be thought invidious, if recourse is again had to the writings of professed Socinians, by way of illustrating the unguarded nature of Dr. H.'s statements. It is not at all hereby insinuated that he himself agrees with them in their peculiar errors; but it is necessary that a Christian University should have some safeguard against Socinians sheltering themselves behind, and using the authority of, Dr. H., which in the present state of his published teaching they might well do, were they inclined,—a safeguard, on the other hand, lest unlearned hearers, unintentionally, and from the fulness of their confidence in Dr. H., find themselves precipitated into the depths of that heresy which Antiquity calls " a god-denying apostasy."

The author already quoted, in a work published before he discovered his own Socinianism, introduces a pattern character speaking thus on his death-bed. " I believe in God the Creator of this world as my Father. I believe his *moral character* (for in regard to

his relations to man I cannot find a better expression) to be that which Jesus Christ his *Son in the sublimest sense*, has revealed to the world. I also believe in his 'Spirit' which helpeth our infirmities; for 'it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure;' not to save us from working, but to aid us in working out our salvation with fear and trembling." *Second Travels of Irish Gentleman*, vol. ii. p. 206.

This author has since confessed, that at the time of writing this he was really a Unitarian or Socinian, though he had not yet brought home the fact to himself. Now, on recurring to the extract above quoted, p. 8, beginning, "There can be no rational doubt," &c., is it not plain that we have a right to demand from Dr. H. some line of separation between him and the above-cited author[a]? The quotations from Dr. Hampden, under the following head, give additional reason for this demand.

[a] The clause "died on the cross for our sins," &c. will be noticed presently.

3. *Doctrine of the Incarnation.*

Dr. Hampden conceives, that the orthodox doctrine on this subject is grounded on a confused philosophy; that a chief excellence of that particular theory lies in its consistency; on the other hand, that the Unitarian is as dogmatic as the orthodox believer; that in this lies his essential fault; that, as such, he is morally wrong, not in that he holds Christ to be a mere man, but because he makes any opinion at all on the subject a reason of separation.

"The discussions on the Incarnation were, in like manner, partly physical, partly logical. It was attempted to be explained, in what way the Son might be said to be generated of the Father; whether out of the substance of God, or out of a common divinity, of which each participates, or by division of the Paternal substance, as a portion severed from the Father; whether further, He is the Son of God by nature, or necessity, or will, or predestination, or adoption. The confusion of principles of different sciences in these promiscuous inquiries is sufficiently apparent. But it was by such a philosophy that the orthodox language was settled, declaring the Son begotten, before all worlds, of *one substance* (sic) with the Father."—B. L. p. 137.

"The excellence of the orthodox theory, we may observe, consisted in its excluding from that definition all ideas imported from the physical speculations, and reducing it to perfect consistency with the original theory of the Divine Procession. It brought the inquirer back to the point from which he set out, to acknowledge the simple divine personality

of the Saviour, that he was the Word made flesh."—B. L. p. 139.

"In the theory of the Incarnation, certain distinctions in Christ were the data; and the problem was to find a common idea in which they should agree."—B. L. p. 479.

"I would take the extreme case of the Unitarians: I would say to them; Why do you take so much pains to convince the world, that you do not agree with the mass of professing Christians in believing in the same sense, "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God, and Father of all? Is it not, that you identify your religion with your dogmas, that you transfer the natural partiality of your own minds for certain principles to the broad outlines of Scripture truth, and dissent from your brethren in the faith, because they will not assent to your metaphysical conclusions? For when I look at the reception by the Unitarians, both of the Old and New Testament, I cannot, for my part, strongly as I dislike their theology, deny to those, who acknowledge this basis of divine facts, the name of Christians. I allude to the case of the Unitarian more particularly, because in the ordinary view, he is regarded as more liberal, as less exclusive in his creed, than members of other Christian communions. And I wish it to be considered whether he is not, on the other hand, as dogmatic as any other religionist; perhaps the most so of all, so far as he insists, beyond all others, on applying a positive sense to passages and expressions, which revelation leaves in the darkness of the clouds surrounding the Divine Presence. Putting him, however, on the same footing precisely of earnest religious zeal and love for the Lord Jesus Christ, on which I should place any other Christian, I propose to him impartially to weigh with himself, whether it is not *theological dogmatism*, and not *religious belief* properly so called, which constitutes the principle of his dissent. But I am not intending to condemn him more than other Christians, on this ground; I select his case, by way of illustration, as an extreme one.

The principle itself is the common fault of us all. In all communions it works its mischief; and without accusing individuals, I propose only to accuse the principle itself, the confusion of theological conclusions and opinions with religion, with a view to its correction by us all."—Observ. p. 19.

4. *Doctrine of the Atonement.*

Dr. Hampden considers that the term Atonement, in its true practical sense, expresses a certain phenomenon in human nature, viz. that it cannot be at peace without the consciousness of Atonement made for its sins; that to this phenomenon of our nature's remorse at its own sin, Scripture opposes a parallel fact, the perfect righteousness of Christ, which it connects with our unrighteousness, and hence Christ is emphatically called our Atonement; that Atonement in a wider sense expresses the general law of Divine Providence under which this instance of God sending His Son falls, which is also called Mediation; but that in Scripture it means nothing but the simple history of Christ's mercy, and we must not theorize upon it; that it does not imply any changing of God's purpose towards man in consequence; that it was converted by Scholasticism into the philosophy of expiation, which depressed the mind, or into a theory of commutation; that it is a real Atonement; that we must not suppose that another may not be humbleminded who disbelieves it, merely because such would be our case.—Perhaps it is impossible to do justice to Dr. Hampden's meaning under this head in any words but his own.

"In collecting the truth from observations on the natural world, our business is to search and hunt out *what is the fact,* (sic) . . . . but in learning the truth of God from

Scripture, we have the facts laid before us; they are entirely out of the reach of our investigation, and are at once by the word of the Spirit mercifully stated to us, in forms of expression calculated to impress them on our hearts, and enforce them on our belief and conduct. For instance, the great fact that God sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world that the world by him should be saved, what powers of investigation, however clearsighted or however lofty, could ever have discovered? Reason may surmise the truth, so far as it is included in a general law of Divine Providence, expressed under the term mediation or atonement, of which it is a transcendent instance. But this is not to reach the fact itself. The necessity, then, of the case clearly requires, that the facts of which our scriptural information consists shall be fully made known to us, so far as it is necessary for us to *know* them, by the page itself of Scripture. This evidently is that blessing of Christianity to the poor. It appeals to no philosophical powers for the estimate of its simple facts," &c.—Observ. p. 17.

"It is to be remarked, however, how strongly the inefficacy of repentance to wipe away guilt, and restore the sinner to his lost state, has impressed the minds of those who have thought on human nature with any depth of philosophy. It is of little purpose to urge the natural placability of the Divine Being, his mercy, his willingness to receive the penitent. God no doubt is abundantly placable, merciful, and forgiving; still the fact remains. The heart seeks for reparation and satisfaction; its longings are that its sins may be no more remembered, that the characters in which it is written may be blotted out. Hence the congeniality to its feelings of the notion of atonement. The fact is, that we cannot be at peace without some consciousness of atonement made. The word atonement, in its true practical sense, expresses this indisputable fact. . . . . This material and invincible difficulty of the case, the Scripture revelation has met with a parallel fact.

It has said, we have no hope in ourselves; that looking to ourselves we cannot expect happiness; and at the same time has fixed our attention on a Holy One, who did no sin, whose perfect righteousness it has connected with our unrighteousness, and whose strength it has brought to the evil of our weakness. Thus Christ is emphatically said to be our atonement; not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man by what Christ has done, but that *we may know* (sic) that we have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that *our own hearts* may not condemn us."—B. L. p. 251.

"The bane of this philosophy of expiation was, not that it exalted human agency too highly, but that in reality it depressed the power of man too low. The ecclesiastical power stood between the heart and heaven; atonement was converted into a theory of commutation," &c.—B. L. p. 253.

"Other communions are not necessarily in error or heresy, because we hold them to be so; but viewing their opinions as erroneous, we must guard against them, as feeling that we should ourselves be heretical and profane, if we should change and adopt such opinions. For example, as believers in a real Atonement for sin, we may justly feel shocked at the thought which imputes any merit to man, and regard, as a sinful pride in ourselves, the absence of that self-abasement in the sight of God, which is peculiarly impressed on us by this holy truth. But we must not conclude of another, who shuts out of his creed this cardinal doctrine, that he must therefore be proud and self-righteous; for, with all his heterodoxy of language, he *may* be more humble in spirit than many who are more dogmatically correct in their enunciation of the doctrine."—Observ. p. 26.

Remarks on the above.

Article II. says, that Christ "truly suffered, was crucified, dead, and buried, *to reconcile his Father to*

us; and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for the actual sins of men." But Dr. H. says, "Christ is emphatically said to be our atonement, *not that we may attribute to God any change of purpose towards man* by what Christ has done; but that we *may know that we* have passed from the death of sin to the life of righteousness by *Him*, and that our own *hearts* may not condemn us." His view of Christ's sacrifice is, that, since we have by nature a keen sense of guilt, and will not believe that God loves us till we see some token of His love, He sent His Son into the world as such a token, to live and die as a man for our sakes; and this is a proof and pledge to us of His love, but nothing more. In no sense is His death revealed as an expiation made towards God the Father, an appeasing of His wrath, &c. Now, if this is Dr. H.'s meaning, I ask, *in what sense* does he understand the words of the Article above quoted? If according to their natural construction, then I ask, *in what sense* does he understand his own words which follow them? Dr. H.'s readers have a claim on him for an explanation.

But this is not all; for here again, by a great infelicity, Dr. H. has expressed himself after the manner of Socinus and his school. The extracts which follow from their writings are made, not for an instant with a view of implying that Dr. H. himself agrees with them, but to show that any one who did not know of his published assurances to the contrary, would have a right to consider that Dr. H. did agree with those misbelievers in a capital article of their misbelief.

Let us first turn to F. Socinus's Disputation De Jesu Christo Servatore, part i. ch. viii.

"We are then reconciled to God through Christ; God exhorting us, through him and his representatives the Apostles, to be willing to be reconciled to him, and offering us freely pardon of our sins: but not Christ making Him propitious towards us, and paying to Him our debts[a]."

Vide also Crellius in answer to Grotius de Satisfactione Christi, cap. vii.[b]

The following passage is from Slichtingius's comment on the Romans.

"*We are reconciled to God;* viz. by God Himself, who has reconciled us unto Himself, that is, has converted to Himself us who were in mind and works without any cause, nay, after the experience of numberless benefits, averse to Him; has altogether extinguished in our minds the hatred of Him; and instead has kindled a most fervent love for Him, by the death of His Son, viz. in the act of giving Him up to death for our sins, &c. . . . . We see in this passage, [2 Cor. v. 19—21.] that Christ died not while God was angry and at enmity with the world, but the world with God; therefore the death of Christ did not effect the reconciliation of God to the world, but that of the world to God[c]."

[a] "Reconciliati igitur sumus Deo per Christum, Deo per ipsum, et per ejus vicarios Apostolos hortante, ut sibi reconciliari velimus, delictorumque veniam nobis ultro offerente: non autem Christo illum nobis placante, et illi debita nostra persolvente." Biblioth. Fratr. Polon. vol. ii. p. 138.

[b] Ibid. vol. v. p. 146.

[c] "*Reconciliati sumus Deo.* Nempe ab ipso Deo, qui nos sibi reconciliavit, id est animo et factis sine ullâ causâ à se aversos, imo innumeris beneficiis affectos, ad se convertit, odium sui in animis nostris penitus extinxit, amorem vero sui ardentissimum accendit per mortem Filii sui, dum scilicet illum in mortem pro peccatis nostris tradit, &c. . . . . Videmus hic non

What makes this coincidence the more unfortunate is, that it is Dr. H.'s practice in writing, too frequently to omit any clear allusion to the *death* of Christ as our Redeemer even in such formal statements of doctrine as ought to contain it. *E. g.*

"[Scripture] has fixed our attention on a Holy One, who did no sin, whose perfect *righteousness* it has connected with our unrighteousness, and whose *strength* it has brought to the evil of our weakness."—B. L. p. 252.

Again:

"Take the truth simply, and what does it mean, but that God is infinitely just and merciful, visiting iniquities to the third and fourth generation, and yet showing mercy to thousands; that we cannot please Him by our works, or our sacrifices, or our prayers, but yet we can *do all* things, by Christ strengthening us, *working for us, offering Himself for us*, praying for us."—B L. p. 254.

Here is doubtless a much stronger wording than in the former extract, still it is a very guarded and reserved statement of the doctrine of the Atonement, as must be admitted. He uses many phrases, but the notion of Christ's cross, passion, death, or the like, does not occur. What can be the meaning of this? Is it done on purpose? Dr. H. is not here accused of this, but hearers and readers who do not know him, will be sure so to interpret his silence. What will be the effect of this upon others? Is it not

Deum mundo, sed mundum Deo fuisse infensum et inimicum cum Christus moreretur, proinde per mortem Christi non id esse actum, ut Deus mundo, sed ut mundus Deo reconciliaretur." Ibid. vol. vi. p. 201.

by such suppression on the part of teachers, that unbelief or half-belief is mainly propagated? Is not Locke claimed as a Socinian upon less grounds?

Again:

"There can be no rational doubt that man is in a degraded disadvantageous condition, that Jesus Christ came into the world in the mercy of God, to produce a restoration of man, that He brought life and immortality to light by His coming, *that He died on the cross for our sins, and rose again for our justification, &c.*"—B. L. p. 390.

Here is every thing we can desire, that is, *in our sense of the words*, for they are from Scripture; but let it be observed, it is nothing more than what a Socinian would say, as admitting the canonical authority of St. Paul's Epistles. It will be asked, "What can one desire more?" Just thus much more; proof which we may show to the whole world, not for our own satisfaction, that Dr. H. says something more than a Socinian; proof that he attaches some definite sense to Scripture, and that that is the Church's sense. People at a distance cannot be the better for our private knowledge of him in Oxford.

Once more:

"The great fact, that God sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world, *that the world by Him should be saved*, what powers of investigation, however clear sighted, or however lofty, could ever have discovered? Reason may surmise the truth, so far as it is included in a general law of Divine Providence, expressed under the term Mediation or *Atonement*, of which it is a transcendent instance."—Observ. p. 18.

This extract admits of several remarks. First, let it be observed, that the Atonement is called a *law* of Divine Providence, under which Christ's coming falls. Next, it is synonymous with *Mediation.* And further it is interpreted to be "God's sending His Son into the world, that the *world by Him should be saved.*" Vague all of it, and in Scripture language. It is the kindest thing to say of such a passage, that it is very loosely and inaccurately worded. An unfair person, or a stranger, would not doubt of its accuracy, but impute a worse defect.

5. *The Sacraments.*

Dr. Hampden does not deny that a blessing is *connected* with the reception of the Sacraments, (whether as a condition, or an act of obedience, he does not explain;) but he denies that they are channels and instruments of Divine grace. What he chiefly opposes is, what is commonly called their mystical influence, i. e. a virtue parallel to physical efficiency in visible things, but belonging to an order of things, and directed by laws, about which we know nothing. He denies that the baptismal water is the medium in God's hand of cleansing the soul, considering the notion to have arisen from the belief in magic, prevalent in the first ages of the Church. He holds the same of the Holy Eucharist, and states the received doctrine to have been derived from the same source as that of the remaining five Sacraments adopted by the Church of Rome.

"The theory of the Sacraments, on which I now enter, proceeds on the same view of human salvation. It is an account of the application of the Passion of Christ to the healing of the soul, a collection of remedial measures by which its languors and infirmities may be relieved and strengthened. The Incarnation of Christ is regarded as the primary efficient cause of health to the soul: dispensed by the several Sacraments as the instrumental and secondary causes. As the Incarnation itself was an union of the Divine Word with human nature, so the Sacraments, according to the theoretic view of the Scholastic philosophy, were mystical

unions of words with sensible things, by which the real presence of Christ was both signified and applied to the soul of man, the visible channels through which virtue was conveyed from Christ himself to his mystical body, the Church.... Theologians have not been content to rest on the simple fact of the Divine Ordinance, appointing certain external rites as essential parts of Divine Service on the part of man, available to the blessing of the receiver; but they have treated the Sacraments as effusions of the virtue of Christ, physically quickening and strengthening the soul, in a manner analogous to the invigoration of the body by salutary medicine."—B. L. p. 311.

"The general belief in magic, in the early ages of the Church, may sufficiently account for the ready reception of such a theory of sacramental influence. The maxim of Augustine, "Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum," appears to be in fact an adaptation of the popular belief respecting the power of incantations and charms to the subject of religion. The miracles themselves, indeed, of our Saviour were supposed to act in this manner, even by those who did not impute them to the agency of evil. His word or His touch was sought for by persons acknowledging in faith the reality of his mission.....Our Saviour, whose condescension was shown even to the prejudices of his faithful followers, often accompanied the working of his miracles with significant actions. In the instance of the woman, indeed,.... He is described as having perceived that some one had touched Him, by the fact that *virtue* had gone out of Him; a mode of speaking, characteristic of the prevalent idea concerning the operation of Divine Influence, as of something passing from one body to another."—B. L. p. 315.

"The definition, indeed, given in the Catechism of the Church of England, is exactly what the Scholastic theory suggests; so far, at least, as the language of it characterizes the nature of a sacrament. It is in the subsequent

application of this definition, that the Church of England has modified and improved on the fundamental idea of the Scholastic doctrine, whilst the idea itself is preserved, as being part of the very texture of technical theology."—B. L. p. 313.

"It is a real and true presence which he [Ratramm] asserts; the virtue of Christ acting in the way of efficacious assistance to the receiver of the Sacrament. The Church of England doctrine of the Sacrament, it is well known, is founded on the views given by this author."—B. L. p. 320.

Remarks on the above.

This head may be dismissed with the following quotations from our formularies.

ARTICLE XXV.—"Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses and *effectual* signs of grace and God's good will towards us, *by the which he doth work invisibly in us*, and doth not only *quicken*, but also strengthen and confirm our faith in him."

"*In such* only as worthily receive the same, they *have a wholesome effect or operation.*"

ARTICLE XXVIII.—"The body of Christ is *given, taken, and eaten* in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner."

BAPTISMAL SERVICE.—"Ye have brought this child here to be *baptized.* Ye have prayed that our Lord Jesus Christ would vouchsafe to receive him, *to release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost*, to give him the kingdom of heaven and everlasting life," &c.

"Almighty, everliving God, whose most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, for the forgiveness of our sins, *did shed out of his most precious side both water and blood .... sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin.*"

CATECHISM.—" What are the *benefits* whereof we are partakers thereby [by the Lord's Supper]? The *strengthening and refreshing* of our souls by the body and blood of Christ, *as our bodies are by the bread and wine.*"

COMMUNION SERVICE.—" Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that *our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body*, and our souls washed through his most precious blood."

6. *Doctrine of Original Sin.*

The following is Dr. H.'s comment upon the 9th Article, the Latin text of which is here subjoined:—

"Peccatum originis non est (ut fabulantur Pelagiani) in imitatione Adami situm, sed est vitium, et depravatio naturæ, cujuslibet hominis ex Adamo naturaliter propagati: qua fit, ut ab originali justitia quam longissime distet; ad malum suâ naturâ propendeat, et caro semper adversus spiritum concupiscat, unde in unoquoque nascentium iram Dei atque damnationem meretur."

"Original Sin, accordingly, is always defined by the Schoolmen in negative terms, as a want of original justice, "carentia justitiæ originalis;" or an inordinateness of the desires; or, as in our 9th Article, a fault and depravation of nature, "vitium ac depravatio naturæ." The last indeed *is the most truly technical description of it;* expressing, accurately, the peculiarity of the *theory*, on which the doctrinal statement of original sin has been founded."

"This *theory* of the evil of the world involved also other theories of the same logical philosophy. . . . . This occasioned the introduction of the term *propagation* into the account of the origin of evil. And the *theory*, as thus stated, would be the logical correspondent to the doctrine of grace. . . . . The Pelagians, however, were not satisfied with this account of the matter. Admitting that evil existed in the world, and that the transgression of Adam had been injurious to his posterity, *they still denied its transmission in the way of an hereditary*

taint. . . . . He [Pelagius] contended . . . that the first sin was hurtful to the human race not by *propagation*, but by *example*. . . . . Though the language of the Pelagians did not adequately express the inveteracy of that sinfulness of human nature, which Scripture and the world declare with one voice; *we must allow, I think, that* their grounds were right, so far as they attempted to give a moral account of the fact; and that *their opponents were wrong, so far as they attempted to give a physical or material account of it.*"—B. L. p. 221.

" It is probable then that Pelagius and Celestius intended only to oppose this *material theory;* and to explain the fact of human sinfulness, as I have said, on moral grounds. *In the fact itself, as appears, they did not differ from the orthodox:* so far that they were acquitted of heresy both at Rome and at Jerusalem. *But the acute logic of the African divines* traced their explanations to the consequences; and their influence was interposed to maintain the uniformity of doctrine in the Church."—B. L. p. 230.

7. *Doctrine concerning the Soul.*

" This notion of the *separate existence of the soul* has so incorporated itself with Christian Theology, that we are apt at this day to regard a belief in it as essential to orthodox doctrine. Even in maintaining that such a belief is not essential to Christianity, I may incur the appearance of impugning a vital truth of religion. *I cannot however help viewing this popular belief as a remnant of scholasticism.* I feel assured that the truth of the Resurrection does not depend on such an assumption; that the life and immortality of man, as resting on Christ raised from the dead, is a certain fact in the course of Divine Providence; whatever may be the theories of the soul, and of its connexion with the body."—B. L. p. 310.

8. *Doctrine of Morals.*

To enter into Dr. Hampden's view of Moral Philosophy would be beside the purpose of these pages, were it not that he introduces the subject into his Bampton Lectures. It may then be briefly observed, that he considers the science of morals to be in itself as independent of religion as physics; that it is conversant with certain laws of the human mind; that these rest ultimately upon *fact;* that a man may fulfil the moral law without religion; that religion has reference only to one part of our functions as men; that, if cultivated by itself, it will injuriously engross the whole man; that it is a comfort and enjoyment, but must not be made every thing; that it induces resignation, abstraction, indolence, and requires moral philosophy as its counterpoise.

"It will, I think, appear, that Theology and Ethics are entirely distinct in their nature; in the principles, I mean, on which they are based."—B. L. p. 264.

"The term obligation is a religious one; introduced into morality by that peculiar connexion, which the speculative Theology of the Schools established, between religion and morality."—B. L. p. 297.

"Morality then, it should be observed, is the science of our own internal nature. It ascertains all those principles by which we are actuated in our sentiments and conduct, and establishes the general law in which they all agree. Its office is throughout one of discovery."—B. L. p. 299.

"So independent is the science of Ethics, of the support and the ennobling which it receives from religion, that it would be nothing strange or objectionable in a Revelation, were we to find embodied in its language much of the false Ethical Philosophy, which systems may have established."—B. L. p. 302.

"Holiness, separation from the world, devotion, stillness of the thoughts and the affections, are the means of Religion: Ethics are all activity, all business. Neither will answer the purpose of the other: both are indispensable to the perfection and happiness of human nature."—B. L. p. 302.

"We find Moral Philosophy among ourselves consigned rather to the pulpit than to the chair of the Professor.... It may be enough to refer to the Moral and Metaphysical discussions of Samuel Clarke, as contained in his Sermons at the Boyle Lecture, and to the Moral Philosophy of Butler, as delivered in his Sermons at the Rolls' Chapel. It appears indeed, that Paley's views of Moral Science were originally developed in the same form. A circumstance which has strengthened the prejudice against an independent Moral Philosophy is the fact that the great deistical writers of our country, as Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke, set themselves to the proof of the independence of Ethics on Religion; whilst Cudworth and Clarke, and others have vindicated the intimate connexion between theological and ethical principles.... Both Shaftesbury and Bolingbroke have shown, and I think unanswerably, that the principles of morality are founded in our nature, independently of any system of religious belief, and are in fact obligatory even on the atheist."—M. L. p. 15—18.

"I intend, in asserting the independence of moral obligation on any religious sanction, to refer, in evidence of this position, to the indisputable instances which have appeared of an upright tenor of life, of the duties belonging to the various relations of life, correctly performed by those, who have

wanted the higher inducements to right conduct, resulting from the profession of a better creed. . . . . Many Christians are . . . . virtuous on principles of mere morality, and not through Christian love and faith; for even the Atheist, extreme as his case is, may feel himself under some obligations of virtue, so far as he may perceive that virtue is his interest in the present world."—M. L. pp. 20—22.

"This opinion of the dependence of moral theory on religious truth is, in fact, a remnant of the philosophy of the Middle Ages."—M. L. p. 23.

"Some of the early Fathers of the Church have characterized Christianity in contrast with heathen systems as a 'philosophy of life.' . . . . They might have seen that Christianity interferes not with the principles of human conduct, that its burthen and theme are *salvation* (sic), and not the mere art of happy living."—M. L. pp. 23—25.

"Another circumstance which has operated against the independent study of Moral Philosophy is the fact . . . . . that Christian writers have not only thrown into the shade all mere moral excellence, by placing it in disadvantageous comparison with the principle of Christian Faith, but also by exaggeration of the misery of the present life, have argued the weakness and insufficiency of human philosophy for the guidance of life. . . . . They have been prone to overstate the argument for the future state of retribution held forth by Christianity. . . . . They have not been content with the positive fact that virtue is rewarded to a certain extent in the present state. . . . . Probably their tone of thought on moral subjects was drawn originally from Stoicism, ... but so far as Stoicism was received as a moral guide, it would suggest stern and melancholy views of the present condition of things. It loved to pourtray its wise men indifferent to the course of the world. . . . The good which Moral Philosophy promises is, under the fairest representation of it, remote and contingent. It demands a series of actions, a

continued cultivation of our moral sensibilities. It presupposes, no less than religion, a disposition to believe its promises, and to look patiently for its good."—M. L. p. 29—31.

"Religion sums up all its practical energy in the one quality of Resignation. It takes by the hand those feelings of the heart which look heavenward. Its divine ambition is to loosen the ties which bind us to the present narrow scene of earthly duties, and to fix our thoughts and desires on the invisible spiritual world. . . . . It is essentially abnegation of self, of present endearments, of the world around us, of our own power. . . . It works on the heart by faith, hope, love, patience; means which in themselves divert us from confidence in our own activity, and so far check that activity. That Religion, in *itself alone* (sic), tends to this extreme, is evidenced in the lives of devotees, who have sought an entire abstractedness from society, and endeavoured to realize its sublime influence in their hearts, by stilling every thought into passiveness and repose. We are not to blame such persons for being too religious, for perverting and misrepresenting Religion by excess. Their fault is, that they suffer their minds to imbibe it *exclusively* (sic); that they leave no room for their own nature to develop itself; converting what was given for their comfort and encouragement into a sublime luxury and a holy pastime. The religious instincts of the heart were surely never meant to absorb the whole man, according to the designs of Him, who implanted also both private and social affections in our nature. . . . . Thus Religion and Morality are as two forces, sustaining the equilibrium of our nature. If either existed without the other, we should be carried away into a devious course."—M. L. p. 96—98.

9. *Positive Statements.*

There is so much in Dr. Hampden of a merely negative nature, from the necessary line of his argument, that it is right, before concluding, to select some of his *positive* statements in favour of those views which are generally received.

He is a believer in the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, (as we might be sure beforehand from his position in the University, and the Subscriptions it involves,) and considers them influential on conduct; though he does not believe them as revealed truths, but as unrevealed opinions, and pious deductions, which he has no right to impose upon others. He has no wish to abolish formularies of doctrine, as such, considering them accidentally useful *pro re natâ* in resisting arbitrary theories of Scripture on the other side; and though he thinks all doctrinal forms mutable, and thinks our own formularies more dogmatic than is necessary, and might wish to modify or improve them, he has no hope of ever dispensing with them; both because the restlessness of speculation will never allow of it, and because we are so accustomed to them that change would lead to serious consequences. Moreover, he thinks they are to be maintained while they exist; and that neglect of this duty is latitudinarianism.

1. "By virtue of those very theological opinions, to which I have declared my assent in admitting the Articles of the Church of England, I have signified my denial and exclusion

of opinions, which I think injurious to Christian truth, and derogatory to the character of a true Church of Christ."—Observ. p. 25.

"I, for one, would contend as zealously against Arian or Socinian doctrines as the most strenuous alarmist on the present occasion, though not, perhaps, in the same manner or with the same weapons; and I should be also strongly opposed to the removal of all Subscription on the part of the Clergy."—Postscr. to Observ. p. 13.

"As believers in a real atonement for sin, we may justly feel shocked at the thought which imputes any merit to man," &c.—Observ. p. 26.

"I think every one who has watched the progress of his mind in theological studies, will confess to this fact in his own case; his difficulties in admitting the Articles have gradually diminished; he has seen, more and more, the reasons of them. For my part, I declare such to have been the result on my own mind, and so far from experiencing any objection to the Articles from an increased acquaintance with them by the prosecution of theological study, I have found my disposition to receive them increase from this very circumstance, that I see more fully the reasons of the statements contained in them."—Postscr. to Observ. p. 9.

"So long as the terms of our communion are what they are, as honest men, we must uphold them and teach them. To accommodate them" [i. e. in our teaching] "to different sects, would be virtually to abandon them..... If theological views could have no influence on conduct, like propositions in mathematics, the method might be pursued of simply laying before hearers the different opinions on each point, without expressing our own judgment. But as this is not the case, as questions of this kind are of serious practical influence, we must do our best to prevent any evil, either from unsettled opinion generally, or from any particular opinion that we have reason to think wrong."—Observ. p. 34.

2. " Pious opinions, it must be observed," [such as " the doctrinal statements of our Articles"] " are not parts of revelation."—Observ. p. 14.

" Whilst we agree in the canon of Scripture, in the very words, for the most part, from which we learn what are the objects of faith, we suffer disunion to spread among us, through the various interpretations suggested by our own reasonings on the admitted facts of Scripture."—Observ. p. 7.

" Because I have laid down what I conceive to be the true *theory* of all Articles, and have shown that such statements are essentially variable in their nature, let it not be supposed immediately, that I have questioned the immutability of *religious truth* in itself. My statement applies only to the dogmas or formal propositions which have been devised to define and declare that truth. Let the two statements be kept quite distinct.—Christian truth" [i. e. the *facts* of Scripture? or, the unknown *objective* truth?] " is immutable; doctrinal forms are mutable."—Postscr. to Observ. p. 11.

" Wherever speculative truth is involved, there must be presupposed an opening for improvement."—Observ. p. 22.

3. " Orthodoxy was forced to speak the divine truth in the terms of heretical speculation, if it were only to guard against the novelties which the heretic had introduced. It was the necessity of the case that compelled the orthodox, as themselves freely admit, to employ a phraseology, by which, as experience proves, the naked truth of God has been overborne and obscured."—B. L. p. 376.

" Pious opinions, indeed, we may form. . . . . Such, indeed, are the doctrinal statements of our Articles. I may wish there were less of dogmatism in them; still I cannot but approve them for the piety which pervades them."—Observ. p. 14. Vid. also p. 22.

" I love and admire the Church of England, because I conceive it to be constituted on the right basis of religious

communion; neither dogmatic in its spirit, though the wording of its formularies may often carry the sound of dogmatism ..... nor intolerant and sectarian in its zeal," &c.—Observ. p. 22.

"To exclude theological opinion from religious profession, to endeavour to sweep away the accumulation of ages, would be but the vain attempt suddenly to change the face of the world. Our next best alternative is to modify it, to correct its improper application, and so to obviate its mischievous effects. In truth, I say, it ought not to exist, &c."—Observ. p. 21.

"The theory which I have endeavoured to establish is the very reverse of that system which would emasculate religion by reducing it to mere generalities. I would bring men to think more of the real substance of their religion, and less of its abstractions. I would have them regard it as it is embodied in the life and blood of the Gospel itself, not as it appears in the phantasmagoria of controversial statement."—Postscr. to Observ. p. 14.

"To expect, therefore, that all sects should formally and ostensibly pull down their barriers of separation, and combine in one common mass under the Christian name, seems hopeless, if we are to judge from what is known of human nature. But may not that gentle, and enlightened, and spiritual toleration of dissenting opinions, &c..... insensibly work a blessed change in the minds and hearts of those who are now estranged from us?"—Observ. p. 29.

"The agreement of a community in certain views of Scripture facts is presupposed. The problem before the dogmatic theologian is to preserve that agreement entire, to guard it from a latitudinarianism which would virtually annul it, and to prevent its dissolution by innovators, either within or without the religious society."—B. L. p. 383.

"It appears to me, then, that the occasion for Articles will probably never cease. Were the realism of the human mind

a transient phenomenon, peculiar to one age or one species of philosophy, and not, as is the fact, an instinctive propensity of our intellectual nature, then it might be supposed, that the unsoundness of a metaphysical and logical theology being once fully admitted, the cumbrous machinery might be removed, and the sacred truth allowed to stand forth to view in its own attractive simplicity. But such a result seems rather to be wished and prayed for by a sanguine piety, than reckoned upon in the humbling calculations of human experience. In the mean time it were well to retain, amid all its confessed imperfections, a system of technical theology, by which we are guarded, in some measure, from the exorbitance of religious enthusiasm."—B. L. p. 380.

Conclusion.

Dr. H.'s views then seem at length to issue in the following theory: that there is one and one only truth, that that truth is the record of facts, historical and moral, contained in the text of Scripture; that whatever is beyond that text, even to the classifying of its sentences, is human opinion, and unrevealed; that, though a thoughtful person cannot help forming opinions and theories upon the Scripture record, and is bound to act upon and confess those opinions which he considers to be true, yet he has no right to identify his own opinion on any point, however sacred in itself, with the facts of the revealed history, or to assume that a belief in it is necessary for the salvation of another, or to impose it as a condition of union with another; that, though he considers he cannot be more sure of being right than another, and does not hold his own opinions to be more pious than another's, and will not pronounce heretical opinions (so called) to be dangerous to any being in the world, except to those who do *not* hold them, yet he himself firmly believes the Church's dogmatic statements concerning the Trinity, &c. and at a proper season would contend as zealously against Arian or Socinian doctrines, as those who think that in the case of others belief in them is of importance to eternal salvation; and this, though he considers those statements, as

such, and so far forth as they are distinct from those Scripture facts, which Arians and Socinians hold as religiously as himself, to be "a system of technical theology by which we are guarded" only "in some measure from the exorbitance of theoretic enthusiasm," a system of phrases borrowed from those who differ from us, and useful only in excluding *their* use of them.

It may be excused the present writer, in the wording of these last remarks, to have shown his own sense of the theology which has occasioned them. What may be the issue of the present anxious conflict of opinion in this place, He will order according to His wisdom, who has promised that all things shall work together for good for those who love Him. But should it end in the appointment of Dr. H. to the Theological Chair, he believes that ten years hence, those who are in no way protesting against his appointment now, would, if then alive, feel they had upon them a responsibility greater than has been incurred by Members of this University for many centuries.

THE END.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

STATEMENTS

OF

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,

EXTRACTED FROM

THE PUBLISHED WRITINGS

OF

R. D. HAMPDEN, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
B. FELLOWES, LUDGATE STREET.
1836.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD-STREET-HILL.

ADVERTISEMENT.

These Extracts have been made with the knowledge and sanction of the Author, and they are submitted to the Public as his present views on the points to which they refer: the volume of Parochial Sermons, from which they are chiefly taken, being in course of republication.

STATEMENTS,

&c. &c.

I. Doctrine of the Atonement.

"As in the first Adam, by the unrighteousness of one, all died; so in Christ, the second Adam, —the Lord from heaven,—by the righteousness of one, all were made alive.

"Salvation being thus obtained for us solely through the atoning merits of Christ," &c.—*Sermon* IV. p. 70.

"All men, consequently,—whatsoever be their creed,—whatsoever their religious knowledge,—whatsoever their attainments in righteousness, can only be saved through the satisfaction made once for all on the cross"—*Ibid.* p. 71.

"Let us consider what, agreeably to this view of our obligation as Christian professors, stedfastness in the faith requires of us.—It requires of us to know, and heartily believe, this great fundamental truth—this religion of our religion, if it

may be so termed,—that God was in Jesus Christ reconciling the world to himself. An unreserved faith in the atoning blood of the Divine Redeemer—a faith exclusively devoted to Christ as its proper object—really *Christian* in the notion of it—must be the first great qualification of the believer, in order that he may have stedfastness in his religious profession. 'For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'"—*Sermon* V. p. 98.

"But in learning the truth of God from Scripture, we have the facts laid before us: they are entirely out of the reach of our investigation, and are, at once, by the word of the Spirit, mercifully stated to us, in forms of expression calculated to impress them on our hearts, and enforce them on our belief and conduct. For instance, the great fact, that God sent his Son Jesus Christ into the world, that the world by him should be saved,—what powers of investigation, however clear-sighted, or however lofty, could ever have discovered?"—*Observations on Dissent*, 2d Edit. p. 18.

"As believers in a real atonement for sin, we may justly feel shocked at the thought which imputes any merit to man, and regard as a sinful pride in ourselves, the absence of that self-abase-

ment in the sight of God, which is peculiarly impressed on us by this holy truth."—*Observations on Dissent.* 2d Edit. p. 26.

"Whilst its (the Gospel's) great and peculiar office is, to render us dead to the world that we may live to Christ; it represses the frenzies of fanatical excitement. It throughout subdues and chastens the mysticism to which its invisible realities might carry the susceptible mind, both by express maxims of duty, full of sobriety and prudence, and by its domestic picture of the Redeemer, as one mixing in affable converse with men, and drawing us to him with cords of humanity, no less than by the life-blood flowing from his cross."—*Moral Philos. Lect.* III. p. 99.

II. Original Sin.

"The Scriptural truth of redemption through the blood of Christ is founded upon another great truth of Scripture—the doctrine of Original Sin, as it is termed in the language of theology; or the fact, that mankind are in a degenerate, degraded condition."—*Sermon* IV. p. 68.

"It is no question, here, of the degree of that corruption by which our nature is infected. It is

enough that we are forced to confess that a corruption *exists* in us. And with this humiliating confession, we own the necessity of seeking a Redeemer."—*Sermon* IV. p. 69.

"In learning the truth of our redemption by the blood of Christ, we shall further be instructed by the word of God in the proper nature of our condition in the world,—in our fall from original righteousness,—our consequent corruption,—our state of trial and discipline,—our dependence on the continual providence of God,—the eternity of the life to come,—the certainty of a judgment. In short, every truth of Scripture is cordially received by him who has a faith 'according to knowledge' in the atonement of the Son of God."—*Ibid.* p. 83.

"We are told, that the sting of death is sin. How opposite is this information to the notion generally and practically received in the world respecting the event of death! How little are we accustomed to regard death as a *moral* punishment! From the current of human sentiments and actions, it would appear as if death were only a *natural* evil."—"Whereas, if it be regarded by the light of Scripture as a grievance belonging to our *moral state*—a payment of the debt of *corruption*—rather than the settlement

of our account with mortality—then is there some hope, that by availing ourselves of its moral use, &c."—" He who beholds in sin the sting of death, will find his relief in familiarizing his mind to the thought of death. He will seek to die daily. He will be incessantly labouring to provide an antidote against what he knows to be the only real cause of death—his sinful inclinations—his alienation from God—his love of the world, and of the things of the world."—*Sermon* III. p. 46—50.

" Though the language of the Pelagians did not adequately express the inveteracy of that sinfulness of human nature, which Scripture and the world declare with one voice, we must allow, I think, that their grounds were right, so far as they attempted to give a moral account of the fact; and that their opponents were wrong, so far as they attempted to give a physical or material account of it. Their (the Pelagians') theory of human sinfulness sufficiently accounted for the *actual* sins of men. It showed how our nature might be depraved or improved; that its actual depravation consisted in transgressions, like those of the first parent; but it left unexplained the *tendency* to sin existing in human nature,—a fact evidenced in the difficulty of resistance to temptation; in the self-denial

which right conduct exacts, 'the law warring in the members,' as the Scripture calls it. The following evil example, the assimilating of ourselves to the first transgressor, is only one mode by which this evil tendency finds its way into our conduct, and betrays itself. In itself it is something beyond, and more intimate with our feelings."—*Bampton Lecture*, V. p. 223.

III. Justification by Faith.

"The Christian hearer is, with respect to the salvation of the cross, in the situation of the impotent man described by Saint John as lying by the pool of Bethesda. As this poor sufferer needed some helping hand to put him into the troubled water, in order that he might experience its healing virtue; so must faith be to the hearer of the Gospel, his minister on the way to salvation. The blood of Christ is the Christian's Bethesda. It is that which possesses in it all the healing virtue. But that he may experience its efficacy, he must descend into it. That he may be made clean, he must wash in it. Faith is that by which he must approach it. Faith must guide and support the infirm soul, and put the Christian, as it were, by the hand, into the pool which shall make him whole.

"Hence arises the force of Saint Paul's assertion,

—" that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," — an assertion which our Church has formally embodied in her doctrine of justification by faith. In the exposition of a religion, such as that of Christianity,—exacting of its disciple a strict personal holiness, and raising him to happiness by improving him as to the principles of his own nature — but at the same time leading him to *depend* on a righteousness *not his own* for his ultimate perfection and happiness,—it becomes especially necessary, to lay down the principle of justification in the most explicit manner; and to establish the *human* righteousness which the religion inculcates, on its proper foundation of the *divine* righteousness." —*Sermon* IV. p. 72—74.

" But whereas this tendency in man, to assume merit to himself from some acts of his own, is of perpetual force,—for it is part of that very corruption which demanded the grace of redemption,—it is still necessary that we should preserve that form of sound words, which the Apostle has set forth; and assert our *exclusive* reliance on the efficacy of the Redeemer's blood, in the same unqualified manner, in which this inspired teacher of the Gospel has done. We therefore maintain our justification by faith alone—intending thereby entirely to deny ourselves—entirely to exclude

ourselves from *any merit whatever* in saving the soul alive—utterly to disclaim our own righteousness, even when we are most righteous."—*Sermon* IV. p. 75.

IV. Sanctification by the Holy Spirit.

" 'No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost.' 'If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his:' he is no real Christian—no real believer in the Atonement."—*Sermon* IV. p. 77.

" Are you sincere believers in the doctrine of Sanctification by the Spirit?—You are sanctified in every good word and work. You have contemplated God, as the Helper of your infirmities, the Giver of a new life."—" But how can any one honestly declare the same truth as his own personal conviction, who knows quite the contrary of himself—that he is such an one in his actions with whom the Holy Spirit cannot dwell. He may indeed acknowledge the truth generally. He may be a professor of a system of doctrines in which this particular doctrine enters. But as to any personal acceptance of the truth—which is the point at issue when a man's real religion is looked into—he is as one who has never 'heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' The grace

on which we heartily rely, speaks from the actions which it sanctifies."—*Sermon* VII. pp. 160, 161.

"It is true, indeed, that those who have heartily embraced their religion, will feel that sincerity of conviction—that ardency of heavenly love—that inward consolation and joy and fulness of hope,—which it is the office of the Holy Spirit to impart to the faithful servant of Christ: for Christ sends even now his Comforter, according to his promise, to strengthen the heart of faith: but let us recollect, that such as are animated by this holy joy,—such as feel 'their faith of eternal salvation to be enjoyed through Christ' established and confirmed, and the 'love of God fervently kindled' in them,—do not arrogate to themselves any *sudden* and *groundless* confidence. The reality of the Divine presence by the Spirit with the believer, must not be confounded with the gross imaginations of the heart of man. Their feeling of joy is the *result* of conduct harmonizing with their belief, and strengthening their belief by its accordance." . . . "They find their hope of free justification—their trust of being made sons of God by adoption—'full of sweet, pleasant, and unspeakable comfort,'—*because* they are 'godly persons'—*because* they are 'walking religiously in good

works,'—*because* they are becoming, (as they reasonably judge of themselves, by comparison of their present state with their former,) more and more 'like the image of Jesus Christ;'—'feeling in themselves the working of the Spirit, mortifying the works of the flesh, and their earthly members,' as well as 'drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things."—*Sermon* V. pp. 112, 113.

"Every intimation of the Holy Spirit conveyed by the Word of God is, in its strict and proper application, an appeal to the heart of man; and each such appeal is an argument and incitement to duty. Take, for instance, the truth of the resurrection. Here is at once a truth, from which innumerable precepts of duty relating to the whole of the present life, may be deduced. Take again the truth of the sanctification of the Christian by the Holy Ghost: here also results a whole spiritual code for the regulation and purification of the affections and sentiments."—*Observations on Dissent*, p. 12.

"——— those good works which flow from the grace of God, and are sanctified through Christ to the life everlasting."—*Moral Philosophy*, p. 20.

"As Christians, we look to God as our begin-

ning and our end. He is our first mover in whatever we do that is good. The beauty, and the honour, and the happiness of our virtue, are of him, creating us in Jesus Christ unto good works, and sanctifying us by the inspiration of his Spirit."—*Ibid.* p. 103.

V. Resurrection & Future Judgment by Christ.

"But whilst the doctrine of a Resurrection to life eternal, to which the text refers, is pregnant with wise comfort to the afflicted spirit of man,—comfort is not its principal practical intention. As life eternal is the peculiar revelation of Christianity—the exclusive sanction and promise of the faith in Christ Crucified;—the leading application of it must consist in its importance, as an argument for maintaining the Faith with constancy and zeal; so that we may be inheritors of the immortality bequeathed to us by our Redeemer."—*Sermon* V. p. 95.

"Further, he who is deeply impressed with a conviction, that Jesus Christ came into the world to take away sin, will also habitually expect him, as surely about to come again, to vindicate, with power, his despised goodness and long-suffering. Estimating the exceeding sinfulness of sin, by the costliness of the sacrifice made to atone for it, he

will dread its punishment. He will be assured, that so awful an expiation cannot have been undertaken, without the ultimate consequence, that the righteousness of God shall be made hereafter to appear with perfect clearness by the visitation of sin—by its perpetual exile from the kingdom of God;—when 'the Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth.' The Christian's belief in the Atonement of his Saviour, will thus necessarily keep him looking for the day of judgment."—*Sermon* XIX. pp. 412, 413.

"So will your faithful watching, and your unwearied prayer, come up before him, and cause you to be remembered by him in the great day of judgment. In that day he will look on you, and know you to be of those whom he has adopted as sons,—whom his Well-beloved died to save,—whom his Holy Spirit has anointed and sanctified to life eternal."—*Ibid,* p. 426.

VI. Incarnation; Divinity of Christ.

"I, for one, would contend as zealously against Arian or Socinian doctrines as the most strenuous

alarmist."—*Postscript to Observations on Dissent*, p. 13.

"He that sincerely believes in Jesus Christ as his Redeemer—regarding him, as the Son of God made man—the co-equal in glory with the Father and the Holy Spirit, disrobing himself of that light in which he walked unseen by mortal eye, and entering the lowly tabernacle of the flesh for the sake of men—for the sake of us miserable sinners—he, I say, who sincerely believes this wonderful fact, cannot but feel his heart dilate with reverential love and gratitude at the thought. When, in the full consciousness of our own inability to retrieve the ruin of our souls, we consider the great mercy we have obtained—no less than the gift of immortality with God, when we had forfeited even the happiness of our earthly condition—and contemplate God through the veil of the Incarnation, *himself* paying the ransom of our freedom—do not our hearts burn within us? And are we not ready," &c.—*Sermon* IV. p. 84.

"You will readily allow this, if you consider who that sacred Person was, whose presentation in the Temple was thus greeted by these favoured saints of God. My Brethren!—if you have listened to the voice of Scripture with that docility —with that humble resignation of the thoughts of

your heart—which the authority of a Divine message exacts from those to whom it is sent—you will not require to be told by me now—or be startled at the declaration, as if it were a setting forth of new and unheard-of things,—that the precious burden which Simeon held in his arms, as he thus poured forth the devotion of his heart, was no other than the incarnate God—the Word made flesh—the Lord of Hosts, appearing in fashion as a man. You will be pleased to recognize in the most exalted description, that I may give you, of this holiest first-born, that conception of him, which has ever been the animating principle of your religious sentiments. You will remember, that Saint John has introduced him to our devout contemplation at the very opening of his gospel, (as if designedly pre-occupying the mind of his readers with that notion of Jesus Christ, which should accompany their reading of him throughout the book,) as the Word that 'was in the beginning with God and was God;'—adding, that 'by him all things were made, and without him was not any thing made that was made:' that he is described as 'the only-begotten Son of God,'—that is, the Son of God, not born in the manner, in which all other sons of God, whether angels or men, are born, but in an eminently peculiar manner of derivation, constituting him *the only Son*, and rendering it no

presumption in him 'to be equal with God.' With these pointed expressions, declaring the supreme dignity of Jesus Christ, you will have combined many other intimations of his Divine nature; found, not only in the writings of the inspired preachers of the Gospel, but in those sublime anticipations of him, which glow in the pages of the Jewish prophets. From a great number of passages of Scripture, accordingly, you will have been already convinced, that the wonderful Person, then hailed by Simeon and Anna at his appearance in the Temple, and by whose name we are called—was neither an angelic spirit;—nor man alone:—that, whilst in all things he was made like unto us, sin only excepted, he was also no less, perfect God;—that in him were united two distinct natures—the divine and the human—through which mysterious union, he became the Christ—'Christ the Lord'—'the Lord's Christ.'" —*Sermon* IX. p. 195—198.

VII. Trinity in Unity.

"The only ancient, only catholic, truth is the Scriptural fact. Let us hold that fast in its depth and breadth—in nothing extenuating, in nothing abridging it—in simplicity and sincerity; and we can neither be Sabellians, or

Tritheists, or Socinians."—*Bampton Lecture*, III. p. 249.

"When we look unto Jesus, we must look unto the Father also, who is 'seen' in him; and unto that Holy Spirit who has received of Christ's and 'shewn it' unto us. And so 'by the confession of a true faith,' we shall 'acknowledge the glory of the eternal Trinity.'"—*Sermon* IV. p. 82.

"Thus have we, my brethren, arrived at the knowledge of that sacred mystery, which we denote by the comprehensive expresssion of The Trinity. The doctrine of a Trinity in Unity, is the ineffably sublime result of all that God is related to have done in our behalf, in that narrative of his providences which we call the Bible. It is not a mere dogma, or formal declaration of some opinion concerning God, simply deduced from certain texts of Scripture,—as the adversaries of the faith once delivered to the Saints are apt to assert;—but it is a general *fact*, clearly resulting from all those manifold occasions on which the Deity is manifested to us as we read the pages of the Bible. We discover it, not in the books of Moses—or in the Prophets—or in the Scriptures of the New Testament,—taken by themselves alone, and independently of

each other;—but in the *united* views which they present of the Head of the kingdom of providence. Now, indeed, that we enjoy the full light, we can trace, with more or less clearness, in each separate portion of Scripture, intimations of the doctrine of the Trinity;—nay, even under the very terms by which the Deity is announced to us, in the first chapter of Genesis, those who are acquainted with the original language of the Old Testament, detect striking evidences of the sacred truth:—and, perhaps, no Christian reads the words—'Let *us* make man in *our image*, after *our likeness*'—but recognizes in this form of expression the existence of a plurality of persons in the Godhead.—Accordingly, to enable the believer to perceive that Scripture truth is one and the same throughout, the Church calls our attention to the opening of the scheme of Revelation, by appointing the first and eighteenth chapters of Genesis to be read in the services of the festival, set apart in commemoration of the mystery of the Trinity. But it is *because* we enjoy the full light, and reflect back on the past the rays emitted from the later dispensations of God, that we see these evidences of him in the first revelations. To us, the Prophets of the Old Covenant, speak the message of Apostles and Evangelists, because we have learned their words in the school of Apostles and Evangelists. This,

indeed, is a consideration which must be ever borne in mind, when we bring any particular passage of the older Scriptures in testimony of the doctrine of the Trinity—that we do not rest, or found, the doctrine upon this or that passage; —but that we adduce it only in confirmation of a truth which results from the whole tenour of Scripture—from taking a collective survey of the successive dispensations therein recorded—from viewing God, not only as the Creator and Governor of the world, but also as our Saviour in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ,—and our Comforter and Sanctifier in the person of the Holy Ghost.

This is the firm and impregnable ground on which Christians should maintain the scriptural truth of a Trinity in Unity. They should never suffer themselves to be entangled in mere verbal controversy with the heretical opposers of this doctrine. The clearest intellect, as well as the soundest faith, may be sometimes embarrassed by verbal difficulties—by objections to particular passages—by ingenious interpretations of particular texts, emptying them of that glory which they possess as vehicles of the doctrine of the Trinity; but there is no disturbing the faith or the sense of that Christian, who points to the Bible as a *whole*, containing this doctrine in it as a *matter of fact*—as a truth

identified with, and *inseparable from*, the *events* which it records."—*Sermon* II. p. 27—30.

"From these facts, therefore, reaching from the foundation of the world, and completed by the declaration of him in his only-begotten Son, we *know* assuredly, that we are bound to feel the same religious regards towards the sacred person who redeemed us, and towards him who enlightens and sanctifies the heart, which we feel towards him who is the Father and Governor of all things; and yet that we are not to worship the Holy Three, as if they were three Gods, or three Lords, but as of one Godhead, one glory, one majesty; since the unity of God is no less a fact recorded in the whole volume of Scripture than his Trinity is; and as strongly inculcated on us by those very transactions on the part of God which reveal to us his threefold nature."—*Sermon* II. p. 32.

VIII. Athanasian Creed, &c.

"It may be worth while to state, that it is upon this view of the doctrine of the Trinity that the formulary of the Athanasian Creed is grounded. If that Creed were an expression of abstract opinions formed by human reason on an incomprehensible subject; *then* it would be both rash and profane in any Church to exact a general

conformity of declaration on a matter so precarious in its foundation. But that Creed, on the contrary, presupposes that the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity is a certain fact of Scripture. It simply notes and records what Scripture reveals, and it delivers no opinion whatever concerning the matters revealed and there specified. As a brief statement, it brings together points which are scattered throughout Scripture, collecting in one the rays that diverge from the various facts of the different dispensations of God. This gives it the appearance of being a declaration of opinions; which appearance is increased from its including a denial of some opinions introduced by heretical innovators upon the faith of Scripture. But we greatly misconceive its nature, if we imagine that it speaks the language of speculative theology. Such is not the spirit in which it has been adopted by our Church. Our Church, humbly following Scripture, wishes all her members to make a true confession of what they learn from Scripture; and, therefore, as I conceive, appoints the doctrine of the Trinity, as the most comprehensive declaration of Scripture truths—as the doctrine in which all other doctrines ultimately centre—to be confessed by her members with peculiar emphasis and distinctness on certain occasions. It is in this spirit, that, as it seems to me, (whatever may have been the

design of the composer of the Athanasian Creed, or in whatever way it may be received by the Church of Rome,) our Church at least has made it one of her standing formularies. If accordingly, the providences of God related in the Bible lead us to a belief in the triune being of God as a certain fact,—shall we not admit the sound wisdom and propriety of our declaring this fact in the boldest and most solemn manner,—stating it with precision where heretics have defaced and obscured it,—and showing, that we hold it as *a truth* of divine Revelation, (nothing in which can have been given in vain,) by adding our profession of its unspeakable importance? If we must admit all this, we admit, at the same time, the excellence and the use of the Athanasian Creed; for it has done nothing more than this.—I trust, my Christian brethren, that with this view of our case, we shall be allowed to confess, that,—'he that will be saved must thus think of the Trinity;'—without having either a want of charity, or a vain dogmatism, imputed to us."—*Sermon* II. pp. 35—38.

"[*Note.*] The right statement of the Incarnation, added in the Creed, is essential to the right statement of the Trinity."—*Ibid.*

"It appears to me, then, that the occasion

for Articles will probably never cease. At the same time we must not suppose, that the same immutability belongs to Articles of Religion, which we ascribe properly to Scripture-facts alone. As records of opinions they are essentially variable. It is no impeachment of their truth, to regard them as capable of improvement,—of more perfect adaptation to the existing circumstances of the Church at different periods. As to the difficulty and hazard of any actual alteration, I have nothing to say. I do not presume to say, that alteration is actually required. I am merely addressing myself to the general question, as to the capacity of improvement in Church-Creeds and Articles, with the view of suggesting a right theory of the subject. To deny the essential variableness of such documents, is, to admit an human authority to a parity with the authority of Inspiration. It is to incur the imputation, which members of the Roman Communion have sometimes brought against the Church of England; that, professing to make the Scriptures the sole rule of faith, we have inconsistently adopted another rule of faith in the deference paid to our Articles."—*Bampton Lecture*, VIII. pp. 380, 381.

"Consider, on the other side, the case of the Articles. What is the difficulty in accepting these? Is it the inconceivable nature of the

statements there made by the Church? The fact is proved to be otherwise. For let any one commence the study of them, and the more acquaintance he obtains with the controversies agitated from time to time, the more he enters into the characters of the agents at the different periods of Church history, and the spirit of the times when each dispute was most active; the more learning, in short, he acquires, the more opened his mind is by study;—the more do his difficulties disappear: he sees the reasons, more and more, for particular statements, and the more readily assents to the several expositions of doctrine. I think every one, who has watched the progress of his mind in theological studies, will confess to this fact in his own case. His difficulties in admitting the Articles have gradually diminished: he has seen more and more the *reasons* of them. For my part, I declare such to have been the result on my own mind; and, so far from experiencing any objection to the Articles from an increased acquaintance with them by the prosecution of theological study, I have found my disposition to receive them increase, from this very circumstance, that I see more fully the *reasons* of the statements contained in them."—*Postscript to Observations on Dissent*, p. 9.

IX. Inspiration of Scripture.

"Whilst our faith proceeds from the operation of the Holy Ghost on our hearts, it is through the word given by the Holy Ghost in the Scripture, that our faith is formed and perfected. That is the audible voice of the Spirit calling us to the Gospel-redemption. Our ears must be opened to the speaking oracles of the Spirit; and then his still and mysterious voice, perceptible only in the inmost heart, (if perceptible it may be called,) will not be wanting to us. Agreeably to this, Saint Paul speaks of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, as able to make the reader 'wise unto salvation *through faith* which is in Christ Jesus.' The word preached and delivered in Scripture does not 'profit' indeed, 'not being mixed with faith in them that' hear or read it. It must be heard and read with a view to that precious redemption of which it tells; that is the master-key to God's manifold dispensations; but it must be surveyed and studied *throughout*, in order to a right faith in the redemption of which it treats. We cannot form any just notion of the sacrifice of the Cross, without an enlarged knowledge of the scheme of revelation. We do not, as some may erroneously suppose, arrive at our knowledge of the nature of the Person and sufferings of Jesus Christ, by simply dwelling on the transactions of Gethsemane and of Calvary; nor even by the

descriptions of him contained in the writings of the New Testament; but by making ourselves familiar with Scripture in all its parts."—*Sermon* IV. p. 80—82.

"When God gave an express revelation to man he signified to human reason,—'hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed,'—He appointed that revelation to be accepted by reason, not to be measured by it.—And none therefore, who apply their reason as the measure of divine truth, can reach its height. The great Corner-stone of the Gospel cannot be quarried out with tools of mere earthly manufacture. It must be dug and fashioned with those, which the Holy Ghost has placed in our hands, in giving us the Scriptures."—*Serm.* V. pp. 101, 102.

X. Means of Grace.

"Those of us, my brethren, who have been faithfully carried to Christ in baptism, have been so grafted; so far as God's promise, of receiving all who come to him in that sacrament, is involved. We have *thus* been born of God. But the healthiness of that graft—the *abiding* in Christ,—is a matter of our own personal faith,—of our personal endeavours to strengthen the grace

given to us in the laver of regeneration. If you are now, therefore, abiding in Christ, know that you have cherished in you the Communion of the Spirit. Give God the glory of your faith. Humbly thank him, that you 'have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby,' being endeared to him as his children in Christ, you are enabled, *as such*, to 'cry Abba, Father.' And henceforth 'grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.' "—*Sermon* IV. p. 79.

"Proceed, then, to ask yourselves, whether your faith is indeed the Atonement of the Cross *revealed to your hearts*—whether it realizes *in your* case the Atonement made for sin? Look to the points to which I have called your attention. Has your faith brought you to God the Father, as his sons by a new creation; as really born of him? Is it founded on a trust in the secret indwelling of the Spirit in your hearts; and maintained, by cherishing that blessed communion, according to the appointed means? To ascertain this satisfactorily,—inquire of yourselves, whether you have strictly followed the directions of Scripture in order to obtaining the Spirit of sanctification: whether you have sought the gift of a saving faith in Christ, by the *means of grace*,—by prayer, the word of God, and the sacraments. Unless you have thus rooted and stablished yourselves in the

faith, it is too certain that you have not a justifying faith. That must come from the Spirit. If, then, you have not fervently prayed for the Spirit,—if you have not made yourselves familiar with the words of the Spirit,—if you have not valued the washing of the Spirit in baptism,—nor fed on the banquet of the Spirit by partaking of the mystical food of Christ's body and blood;—where is there any ground of trust, that you have that faith which is the gift of the Spirit?"—*Sermon* IV. pp. 89, 90.

"Who, then, can justly question the importance of prayer? For, whilst the Christian is praying, that blessed Person of the Holy Trinity,—to whose immediate care the souls of the redeemed are committed, now that the great High Priest himself is passed into the heavens;—comes down and visits him. Even whilst he prays for the Spirit, the Spirit anticipates the holy request, and is present with the suppliant for his aid."—*Sermon* XIX. p. 419.

"Men are not content with the simple declarations;—'Repent, and be baptized:'—'Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God:'—'Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.' Nor will they

acquiesce in the duty of conforming their practice to these scriptural injunctions.——In regard, indeed, to both the sacraments, singleness of heart is the only human means that we possess of apprehending their true import. 'He which hath said,' observes Hooker, 'of the one sacrament, Wash and be clean;' hath said concerning the other likewise; 'Eat, and live.' If, 'therefore,' he continues, (I quote his words for their general application to the whole subject of the sacraments,) if 'without any such particular and solemn warrant as this is, that poor distressed woman, coming unto Christ for health, could so constantly resolve herself;' 'May I but touch the skirt of his garment, I shall be whole;' what moveth us to argue of the manner how life should come by bread; our duty being here but to take what is offered, and most assuredly to rest persuaded of this, that, can we but eat, we are safe? .... What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not; it is enough, that to me which take them, they are the body and blood of Christ: his promise in witness hereof sufficeth; his word he knoweth which way to accomplish: why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant, but this; O my God, thou art true! O my soul, thou art happy?"—*Bampton Lect.* VII. pp. 343, 344.

XI. Importance and Use of Christian Doctrine.

"Whilst religion purifies, and elevates, and sanctifies the moral feelings, it can effect this Divine purpose only by going hand in hand with those very principles which it would transform to the image of God. For no true religion can contradict the moral nature of man; and the gospel is eminently the gift of one, who 'knew what was in man.'"—*Moral Philosophy*, p. 61.

"We shall find, at the same time, that Religion abstains entirely from the *Science* of Morality. Its only concern is that morality should exist *in fact*—should be exemplified *personally* in all religious men."—*Moral Philosophy*, p. 100.

"You are now fully prepared, I should hope, to go along with me in the assertion, that the doctrine of a Trinity in Unity is one, which, no person who has the Bible before him, and who is able to search and see whether these things are so, can hold it a matter of *indifference* whether he receives or rejects. What I have been endeavouring to impress on you, is, that if the Scriptures exist, this doctrine exists; that it is the very substance of our whole faith; and not a mere article of it: or rather, that either this doctrine *is*, or Christianity is *not;* and that in the act of renouncing it, we depart into another

system of faith, and quit that which results from the records of Scripture. If you are thus persuaded, you place the doctrine on a right footing, and hold it in due honour. But, being thus persuaded, you cannot do otherwise than think, that your salvation is intimately connected with this your right belief."—*Sermon* II. pp. 38, 39.

"Whilst we adopt Christ Crucified, as the fundamental characteristic of our religious profession, we shall maintain the other doctrines of Scripture in their full importance. Taking the Christian Redemption from its proper source—the Scripture—we shall take along with it, all those other holy and edifying truths, with which it is there closely and inseparably intwined. And, thus obtaining a comprehensive and consistent view of the whole scheme of Divine Revelation, we shall not only defy the attacks of the ostensible infidel, but also be proof against the more dangerous wiles of insidious traitors to Christianity, bearing the sacred name of its disciples, whilst breathing war against it in their hearts and their proceedings. Our conviction will be, that we have placed our trust in One, in whom all the counsels of God towards man have their perfection;—and, that though an angel from heaven should preach to us any doctrine at variance with the great mystery of his Atonement, we should believe it not—that all must be

true, which the Scripture has joined with this mystery in the scheme of revelation, however inexplicable to us, however apparently to our judgment unconnected with it;—that whatever militates with this mystery, must be false, however speciously Scriptural in its assertion, and however plausibly supported by ingenuity of argument."—*Sermon* V. p. 105.

"It is mere trifling with the redemption of the Gospel, to say, that we rely on it exclusively for our acceptance with God, and to have no thought of the Redeemer himself:—it is a vain profanation of his blood, to regard it as poured out for our sins, and not to sympathise with the heart from which it flowed:—it is a despite to his grace, to pretend to love his grace, and not to cherish his example, and his word, to receive the pardon, but to slight its obligations."—*Sermon* IV. p. 85.

"Here then you have before you a sketch of that Faith, by which we are said to be justified. To fill up the sketch would be to give you the full portrait of Christianity. For according to the view which I have endeavoured to present to you of it, it is only the comprehensive—the characteristic—expression for the whole religion of the Bible. It is Christianity in the heart—in the actions—on the lips. It is divine power

strengthening human weakness—divine wisdom informing human folly — divine goodness meliorating human corruption — divine love warming human coldness—in a word, the life of God transfused into the life of man."—*Ibid*, p. 87.

"And let us labour to prove, by our lives, the saving efficacy of that pure profession of Christianity, which we make in professing the doctrine of the Trinity. Our unalterable attachment to this sacred truth,—our zeal in defending it,—above all, our wisdom in understanding it,—are best evinced, not by our dexterity in adducing texts in proof of it,—not by our readiness of argument in combating the objections of its opponents—not by our acuteness in distinguishing and guarding our notions from heretical imputations,—not, I say, by all these modes of profession, however useful and indispensable in themselves to the maintenance of the doctrine,—but by still more vital and effectual means,—by shewing forth the love of the Father, almighty in constraining us to the obedience of dutiful children,—the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, almighty in rescuing us from the bonds of sin and death,—the communion of the Holy Ghost, almighty in consecrating our hearts to the service and glory of that Godhead in which the Holy Three are One."—*Sermon* II. pp. 41, 42.

R. CLAY, PRINTER, BREAD-STREET-HILL.

9

STRICTURES

ON AN ARTICLE

IN THE EDINBURGH REVIEW;

ENTITLED,

"THE OXFORD MALIGNANTS AND DR. HAMPDEN,"

WITH SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE PRESENT STATE OF THE HAMPDEN CONTROVERSY.

BY

A MEMBER OF CONVOCATION.

Ανθρωπε, πρωτον επισκεψαι, οποιον εστι το πραγμα· ειτα και την σεαυτου φυσιν καταμαθε, ει δυνασαι βαστασαι.

EPICT. ENCHIR. cap. 36.

OXFORD:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY J. VINCENT,

1836.

STRICTURES

ON AN ARTICLE

IN THE EDINBURGH REVIEW.

THE disastrous appointment of Dr. Hampden to the chair of the Regius Professor of Divinity in this University is, it must be confessed, in itself sufficiently unfortunate, and does not need extraneous causes of disquietude and vexation. The existence of disunion within these walls is sufficiently alarming to the friends of the Church, and sufficiently encouraging to her enemies, without the infusion of violence and an asperity, which renders that disunion a greater scandal in the eyes of those who are watching our movements in the present crisis; some with an affectionate jealousy, others with the malignant scrutiny of foes, but all with an anxious and watchful interest.

It will be readily granted, that a controversy, such as is that in which we are now engaged,

should be conducted with patience and calmness, and in a spirit of Christian charity and meekness. If our object be truth, and our motive principle of action a *love* of truth; that object cannot most assuredly be accomplished, nor that motive exhibited, if we indulge ourselves in conduct which bears on its front the impress of party zeal, rather than that of mutual forbearance, so that if we, who are sincerely adverse to the late appointment of Dr. Hampden, feel ourselves called upon by the urgent commands of duty, to bear testimony to the truth, we must remember, that it is equally our duty to speak that truth in love: and so again, if there be any who think that we are mistaken, it is their duty, and not less is it their interest, to lead us to entertain more correct views by mild reasonings and patient rebuke. "*Expostulation* should be addressed to *friends* acting in *error; accusation* to *enemies* who have acted *unjustly*."

If this be so, the several statements which have emanated from the advocates of the two parties throughout this unhappy controversy, will afford some criterion, by which we may judge how far those parties have been respectively distinguished by a spirit of Christian charity and love. If for example, on the one hand, we discern an acrimonious temper vénting itself in a savage asperity of style worthy of the master spirit of the age, (the great fountain head of vulgar ribaldry and abuse) while, on the other hand, is to be seen for the

most part, the union of righteous zeal and godly jealousy, with the softest and kindliest spirit of Christian charity and love; it becomes a matter worthy of consideration, whether or no such different systems of conduct do not spring from two totally different principles; and whether the *causes* of such conduct, alike honourable to the one and disgraceful to the other party, are not to be sought for in the essentially different nature of the opposed sides.

And that to the opponents of Dr. Hampden belongs the praise, in spite of the insinuations of our adversaries, of having preserved this moderation; and that to his supporters must attach the disgrace of having sullied the serious subject with an abundance of angry abuse, may be easily seen by a reference to those pamphlets which may be considered the champions and mouth-pieces of the two parties.

On the one hand we have,

The Elucidations of Dr. Hampden's Theology.

The Theological Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles compared, with a preface by Dr. Pusey.

Mr. Woodgate's letter to Lord Melbourne.

Mr. Miller's conspectus of the Hampden case.

On the other,

The Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and in the subsequent editions the postscript of Jortin Redivivus.

The Pastoral Letter to his Holiness the Pope.

The five last pages of Dr. Hampden's Inaugural Lecture.

The Speech of the Senior Proctor.

There are others besides these, but not one of the statements which have emanated from Dr. Hampden's friends, reaches the point at issue; they deal universally in hard words, in disingenuous recriminations, in puerile *Tu quoques. Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis!*

So long however, as gross insinuations and unfounded calumnies were confined to the pages of anonymous pamphlets, or even to the bad Latin of a retiring Proctor, they might have been safely and wisely suffered to pass into their proper obscurity; so long as a wholesale slanderer thought to consult the honour of his cause by dealing hard blows, himself unobserved and unknown, there was no danger of any mischief resulting from his dishonourable labours. The world might for a time have wondered that one so bold in acting the part of informer, should be yet so timid as to fear the avowal of his name; but that wonder would only have ended in unmitigated contempt of the writer, and in unqualified pity for his cause. But the case is somewhat altered, when these acccusations are fulminated upon us from the columns of the Edinburgh review. Its pages give, or rather ought to give, a kind of responsibility to what they contain, equal if not superior, to that individual and personal responsibility which is entailed on a writer by the publication of his name. Deeply indeed, is it to be regretted that a publication which would be thought respectable, which at any

rate professes to be an impartial and unbiassed censor of literature, should so far have prostituted its office, as to condescend to send forth to the world, on the authority of its name, such a tirade of vulgar and illiberal abuse, as is contained in that article of its last number, entitled "The Oxford Malignants and Dr. Hampden."

Again must we protest against the making this controversy a contest of harsh words; it is a question on subjects of the most sacred nature, involving considerations of the utmost importance, and one therefore which must neither be supported or opposed by coarse and intemperate measures: and yet if this view of the case be founded in justice, how lamentably does the Reviewer mistake as well his office, as the nature of the subject which he professes to treat.

It was certainly to have been expected, despite of the uncourteousness of the title, that some line of argument would have been instituted, to show that our proceedings have not been based in justice, or rather agreeably to the principle of the Edinburgh, on *expediency;* it was to have been expected that a large and comprehensive review of the state of the Church and of Ecclesiastical opinion in this country would have been entered upon; that it would have been attempted to be shown that our conduct has been inconsistent with our principles, our professions, our security, our peace; or again, to shift the scene of argument, that a fair theological con-

troversy would have been instituted, and that Dr. Hampden would have been proved to be an orthodox divine, and a safe Professor of Theology.

All this field, and it will be allowed to be a tolerably extensive one, was open to the Reviewer; but this path of reason and common sense he has disdained to tread; any thing like temperance, or moderation suited not the present temper of his mind; it was far more agreeable to his taste to thunder his anathemas against the unfortunate University; and, in the full power of his intellectual supremacy, to deny to our errors palliation, or repentance or excuse.

Of all rational animals he seems to be least indebted to the distinguishing faculty of his species, who refuses to be taught by experience; her lessons are generally enforced with that kind of practical authority, which bends the most stubborn and wayward minds, and yet this same experience has proved unavailing to the reformation of the Edinburgh Review. It might have been hoped, that the disgrace in which it involved itself in its controversy with Oxford, in old time, had operated as a check against its future insolence; but no! hard indeed has the Review been striving for some time past to enforce the conviction that it has ceased to be a fair and candid critic either of literature, politics, or religion; and it is strange indeed, if its last number do not go far to establish

that conviction in the minds of every honest and independent judge.

How the Reviewer obtained so large a number of *bad* names is not indeed easy to be conjectured; it is to be hoped, that amidst his other valuable helps, he had the assistance of a kind of *Slang Concordance*, else his labour must indeed have been burdensome. For instance, he calls us "*Malignants*," (p. 225.) "*Conspirators*," (p. 226.) "*Slanderers*," (p. 227.) we have been involved "in a dilemma of infamy," (p. 227.) (not a very intelligible mode of expression, but this by the way) "*Persecutors*," (p. 231.) "*Judaizing Christians*," (p. 236.) we are not allowed even the excuse of being mistaken men we are all guilty of "*Moral Wickedness*." (p. 238.) In our proceedings there has been "much of the *fraud* and *baseness* and *cruelty* of *fanatical persecutions*." We are not allowed to plead conscience, but like the drunkards of Psittacus's code are doubly guilty, for having blinded our judgment by "*wilful neglect of the highest truth*," or for having corrupted it "*by the habitual indulgence of evil passions*." Finally, the party, of which the assertors of orthodoxy in this University are stated to be the champions, are composed of "*the Hophin and Phinehas school, the mere low, worldly clergy, and grossly ignorant; ministers not of the Gospel but of the aristocracy, who belong to christianity only from the accident of its being established by law;*"

and of the formalist Judaizing fanatics, who have been the peculiar disgrace of the Church of England, having imbibed of fanaticism itself, nothing but the folly and the virulence. (*p.* 235.) To extract all the abuse would indeed be to transcribe the whole article, but enough has been quoted to show the virulence and weakness of the writer, and to warrant the assertion that such grave accusations, such heinous charges ought to be made good by most solid and constraining arguments. But no! the Reviewer has deemed even the show of argumentation unworthy of its character and reputation, and seems by a kind of illogical conversion to have thought its honourable task accomplished when it had transposed its motto, and read it "nocens absolvitur cum judex damnatur."

There are but two instances throughout the article of any thing like a matter of fact or an argument; and it is on such a foundation, that the Reviewer builds his unsightly superstructure of insolent ribaldry. The instances are these. He reiterates the accusation which has been so often brought against the University of having sanctioned Dr. Hampden's opinions, by conferring on him the honour of Professor of Moral Philosophy.

The Reviewer knew, or at least he might have known, that he was only elected by a *bare majority* of even the six individuals with whom the appointment rests, and further he knew, or ought to have

known, that such an appointment could not possibly compromise the University generally, who on the most unfavourable view of the case, were not all concerned in that appointment. The other instance is this. The opposition to Dr. Hampden, at the present time, is stated to have arisen entirely from the part he took some time since, in advocating the substitution of a Declaration at Matriculation, for the present system of Subscription to the Articles; and, by a most marvellous weakness, by one of those providential indiscretions by which the crafty are sometimes caught in their own wiliness; that same measure is said to have received the cordial sanction of the Duke of Wellington. If then, political motives, (as the Reviewer would have the world believe, though he does not in truth believe it himself,) have been the springs of our opposition to Dr. Hampden, as well might the University be dissatisfied with its honoured Lord and Chancellor; as well might the Duke of Wellington be an object of our dislike and mistrust, as he is, *in fact*, of our devoted affection and confidence.

Will the world then, on such evidence as this, convict the University of conduct so disgraceful as is charged against it by this bold and ungenerous Reviewer? If that very large portion of the Members of the University, who have been parties to the opposition to Dr. Hampden's appointment, have really been guilty of such baseness and

wickedness as is imputed to them, utterly unworthy are they to hold offices of responsibility and trust in this University.

Is it not right then, nay, is it not absolutely necessary, that the Reviewer should substantiate the charges which he has brought against us? Such accusations must not be dealt out with impertinent flippancy. But to pursue the subject much further at present, would be both useless and disgusting; useless, because the Reviewer must write with more sense and more calmness, before he will obtain credit for his illiberal assertions; and disgusting truly such a controversy would be, while we have to notice with what wicked ingenuity facts "parce detorta" are wrested to fulfill the discreditable purpose of the writer; to mark the absence of all moral principle which pervades the statement; and to watch how for the gratification of the paltriest purposes, truth and charity are made to yield to the violence of party and sectarian zeal. It would however be unfair to conclude this part of the subject, without calling attention to the very able manner in which the Reviewer has drawn his portrait of Dr. Hampden delivering his Inaugural Lecture. His minutest features did not escape the observation of the imaginative painter; his eyes, his gait, his countenance, his voice, are described with a vividness and a reality which we cannot but deem remarkable, when we know that in all probability

that portrait was drawn full seventy miles away from the Divinity School. It may be that we are indebted to the freedom of the imagination, for the force and naturalness of the picture; but in sober seriousness, it is too disgracefnl to stoop to such low devices for the sake of trumping up a cause, which, if it were not in itself too weak to stand, would most assuredly fall through the folly and violence of its advocates.

Where there is much reason to fear that the misrepresentations of the Reviewer are not those of ignorance but of intention, it would be useless to institute a counter statement to his uncandid assertions. It would be useless to tell him how many a struggle the present controversy has cost those persons who are more prominently engaged in it; in how many cases the dearest sacrifices have been made to truth and duty—to tell him that many of us have incurred the loss of dear and valued friends; that all of us have had to keep a zealous watch over ourselves, not lest we might fall into intemperance and over heated excitement, but lest the enticing allurements of personal feeling and comfort should tempt us to disobey the voice, and slight the interests of more solid, yet less inviting truth. The Reviewer has not feelings to appreciate our conduct or motives aright, he is carried away by passion that most dangerous of guides, and in the service of that imperious master, he has not disdained to stoop to the most unworhy devices.

It is not in a spirit of curiosity, but in sober earnestness that we are disposed to ask, is the Reviewer a *scholar*? Is he a *clergyman*? Nay more, is he a clergyman who has *the superintendence of youth?* If so, let him search and ask for himself, whether he has received his sentiments from the pages of the Gospel? Whether he has not regulated his feeling in accordance with the spirit of Christianity, whether he has not in truth been guilty of "exactly reversing the precept of St. Paul, which bids us in malice to be children, but in understanding to be men?" Has he treated the subject of the University controversy as it is, a religious subject, in a religious point of view? Has he not rather adulterated the simple facts of the case by a copious alloy of the politics of the day? Has he not betrayed his real parricidal intentions by allusion to those questions of innovation in our Academical system which have been of late years the subject of so much vexatious controversy? Does he suppose that he has promoted the cause which he seems desirous to support? Does he imagine that any cause can stand which rests on no securer foundation than that of recrimination and abuse? Let the Reviewer take a leaf out of his opponents book, (fas est ab hoste doceri:) let him show himself disposed to argue the question on its own abstract merits, without reference to any person or party; and then, though we might still lament his error, we should make all

allowances for his honest intentions. But by his present line of tactics, he has entirely abandoned the arts of civilized warfare, and has shown himself to be at once a powerless and ungenerous foe.

Whatever compliments either vanity or party spirit may whisper into the ear, such conduct is most assuredly, neither becoming the station of the Reviewer, nor the character of the Review. If the Reviewer would be useful in his generation, let him attend with less of distractedness to the more active and peculiar duties of his profession. The atmosphere of violent controversy and angry disputation is indeed, to some persons, refreshing and strengthening. The very air they breathe is unwholesome to them, if it be not loaded with violence and excitement. Yet, nevertheless, such a disposition is not suited to the Christian;—how much less then, to a Christian *clergyman* and *instructor!* Will our anticipations be too sanguine if we look in future for more temper and calmness, and less of violence and party spirit, in our "Malignant" Reviewer? If we hope that he will "not for the future venture out of his depth, or attempt anything he wants opportunity or capacity to accomplish?" If we hope that, "like a wise man, he will consider with himself before he undertakes anything of consequence, whether he hath abilities to carry him through it, and whether *the issue of it is like to be for his credit;* lest he sink under the weight he lays upon himself, and incur

the just censure of rashness, presumption, and folly."*

And now, Mr. Reviewer, adieu! Most sincerely do we wish you a better temper and a more Christian spirit when we meet you next; and, should you be disposed again to engage in this controversy, we would advise you, in all earnestness, to realize our hopes of your amendment; and

> "Sir, were I you, I'd *strive* to be polite,
> *Against my nature.*"

One word more to the Edinburgh Review, and we have finished this part of the subject. If that publication wishes to save itself from obloquy and contempt, it must not dabble in theological controversies—it must not interfere in questions of University discipline. It has had time to take breath from its last inglorious contest with Oxford, and it has evinced more of inconsiderate courage than of sober discretion in entering the lists again. At all events, it would have been well if far other weapons had been used. That violence and unsparingness of invective,

> "which with fools supplies,
> And amply too, the place of being wise,"

is not calculated for disputations like the present. No cause ever has prospered, or ever will prosper, by the employment of such devices. Let the

* Mason on Self-Knowledge.

Edinburgh change its present habits—let a shuffling prevarication yield to a manly spirit of opposition—let an unmannerly impertinence be changed for a respectful and a becoming address—and then will we listen to what may be advanced against us. In the words of Dr. Hampden's Inaugural Lectures, "We are at all times ready to meet fair and open discussion; but to misrepresentation, and clamour, and violence, with God's help, we will never yield."

Having obtruded on public attention for the purpose of answering the unjust aspersions of the Edinburgh Reviewer, we should be unwilling to close the subject without calling attention as briefly as possible to the question now again before Convocation. Most deplorable indeed is it that this controversy should have been thus protracted;—that the indiscretion of a vain Proctor should have "consulted the peace and the dignity of the University and the Church" in a way so peculiarly original. Deplorable indeed is it, on every account. We have every imaginable difficulty to encounter—we are exposed to much misrepresentation and abuse; but this is the least of the vexations which oppress us. What is far more painful and requires, therefore, increased watchfulness and zeal on our parts is, that we are called upon to institute proceedings against an individual, estimable in himself, but unfortunately the assertor of unsound and

dangerous doctrines of Divinity. To many, the contest between private feeling and public duty is most arduous and distressing. It may be that the softer and kindlier feelings attract us to the one side; but the safer, though perhaps less attractive, calls of duty urge us to the other. These, however, are not times in which considerations of private ease and personal comfort are to be preferred to the duty we owe to our venerable and apostolic Church. On us of this University, placed, as it were, in the vanguard of the Christian army, a weighty responsibility rests. If *we* be found traitors, where can we look for fidelity. How can we expect success? Assailed by angry violence and clamour from without—by unrelenting foes, who are ever on the watch—what peace can await that Church, if betrayed and surrendered from within? At this season are we especially called on to "walk about Zion, and go round about her, and tell the towers thereof: to mark well her bulwarks, consider her palaces, that we may tell it to the generation following." For never, perhaps, within the range of ecclesiastical history, was the Church so *tried* as at the present moment. Already are there strifes and seditions amongst us: God grant they be not multiplied and increased.

The real state of the question is, *to all practical purposes*, the same as it was when last under the consideration of Convocation. On that occassion

upwards of four hundred persons, under great discouragements, were prepared to testify their dissent from Dr. Hampden's principles, and to rescue the University from the imputation of recognising them. And surely they will not look back, now that they have once put their hand to the plough—surely the insinuations and taunts of newspapers and reviews will not have any effect on them. Doubtless we shall show to the world that our attachment to the Church, and her pure doctrines and formularies, is not varying and inconstant—that our opposition to Dr. Hampden is not the result of a mere feeling of impulse, called into play by the excited fervour of the moment, but subsiding when the lenitives of time and thought have been applied. The cause we advocate is of an unaltered and unalterable nature. What was true in the month of March is true in April, and will be true for ever. If Dr. Hampden was unworthy of our confidence as a Theological Professor then, so is he now. No explanation of his own *personal* opinions can for a moment be held valid in his excuse; no retractation of particular passages; no *alteration of his peculiar phraseology;* which last is, indeed, the only change he seems inclined to adopt. (Inaug. Lect. p. 28.) If Dr. Hampden's opinions, as developed in his Bampton Lectures, are heretical and unsound, then is he heretical and unsound in faith still—still is he undeserving of our confidence. Nor let this con-

sideration be esteemed of slight importance. It is very essential to the right understanding of this point, that the following passage of the Declaration of March 10th should be kept in mind:—"We cannot allow any explanations of insulated opinions or particular words to be valid in excuse against the positive language, the *systematic reasoning*, and the *depreciating tone*, in which, in Dr. Hampden's works, the Articles of our Church are described as mere human speculations—the relics of a false and exploded philosophy, full at once of error and mischief." How then does the Inaugural Lecture influence the question? That Lecture is contradictory to Dr. Hampden's other published writings, or it is not. If it is, why does not Dr. Hampden ingenuously and manfully retract his former opinions altogether. If it is not, then, of course, we revert to the original writings, and pronounce them to be unsound in *principle*, and dangerous in their *tendency*.

How entirely Dr. Hampden and his friends mistake the point at issue, may be seen by an advertisement to a pamphlet, entitled "Statements of Christian Doctrine, extracted from the published writings of Professor Hampden," which contain the following words:—"These extracts are made with the knowledge and sanction of the author, and they are submitted to the public *as his present views* on the subjects to which they refer." This only adds confusion to confusion; for we have in-

consistency without the benefit of retractation; and the errors of Dr. Hampden's opinions become multiplied; for we have

1st, His Parochial Sermons;

2d, His Bampton Lectures:

3d, The statements chiefly extracted from the Parochial Sermons.

How, then, the objectionable principles of the Bampton Lectures are purged by being pressed on either side by the Parochial Sermons, is not easy to be understood. But it must be plain that the only result to be obtained by a partial explanation is, that inconsistency is added to error; and that Dr. Hampden's teaching becomes a kind of infinite Penelope's web, every later work contradicting the one which immediately preceded it.

In fact, until Dr. Hampden shall see reason to retract, without qualification or reserve, the dangerous principles embodied in his Bampton Lectures, we must say of him, in reference to his soberer publications, what Cicero said of Epicurus who was, as it were, forced by his better nature to advance statements inconsistent with the fundamental principles of his philosophy, "Non id spectandum est quid dicat, sed quid consentaneum sit ei dicere."

Of course no fear of the world's censure or scorn —no feeling of party spirit—no moral cowardice would induce Dr. Hampden to withhold an acknowledgment of his erroneous opinions, if he could

be persuaded that they were erroneous, an acknowledgment no less due to the Church and to the University than to himself. As long, therefore, as those opinions remain uncontradicted, so long we must assume they are entertained; and as long as they are entertained, so long must they operate as a bar to the recognition by the University of Dr. Hampden as her Theological Professor. Meanwhile the Inaugural Lecture possesses no advantage beyond that of being inconsistent with itself. It is at best a mere καλλος κακων ὑπουλον, and it will scarcely be maintained that unsteadiness in doctrine, is any such recommendation in a Regius Professor of Divinity, as to counterbalance the dangers of an obscure and mystical Theology.

Surely then the call will not be made in vain, on the non-resident Members of Convocation. Great indeed, we well know, are the mortifications —great the discouragements to which they are exposed; but we should be paying them a very sorry compliment to suppose, for one moment, that the blandishments of ease, or the suggestions of private feeling, or indolence, or inactivity, or lukewarmness, could tempt them to betray their Church in this her hour of need. The ministers of the Gospel have up to this time, amidst the violent and rude shocks of the political and social world, remained firm and unshaken; on many occasions have they already afforded valuable testimonies of

devotedness to their mother Church; and never did that Church stand in need of more cordial and undivided support than at this present time. Already has a dangerous principle of Theology reared its head within the revered precincts of this University—already are dangerous and unsound views of Scriptural truth promulgated from the professorial chair. It rests perhaps with the Members of Convocation whether this pestilence be at once arrested, or whether it be allowed to spread its baneful, its deadly influence through the length and breadth of the land. But at all events, independently of any consideration of probable consequences, the path of *duty* is plain and open. Results are not indeed in our own disposal, their regulation belongs to a much wiser and better judge than we are, to him then it will be well for us to leave *them;* but we *have duties*, and those duties are of a most important nature—the duties of testifying to the *truth*, of manifesting our attachment to the *Church*, and our uncompromising opposition to a system of Theology, whose tendency is to corrupt the simplicity of Evangelical truth. And what avails it to say that we have great difficulties to encounter? *Undoubtedly we have*, for probably truth never was vindicated against error, except at considerable cost; apply indeed such a principle of excuse to bygone facts of history, and never would the glorious light of the reformation have dawned—never would Christianity have made its way against

the opposing mass of human weakness and corruption and deceit. Such pleas then may suit the unsteady statesman, the wily diplomatist, or the indolent sensualist; but God forbid they should ever be found in the mouth of the Minister of the Gospel of Christ.

Nor let it be thought by any that enough has been done by the manifestation of opinion on the subject at the last Meeting of Convocation. What importance is felt to be attached to the *authoritative* and *formal* declaration of the University by its only legitimate organ, the house of Convocation, may be seen by a reference to Dr. Hampden's correspondence with the Chancellor of the University.* Dr. H. knows full well that individual opposition is comparatively unimportant, that until the University, *as a body*, has authoritatively pronounced him unworthy of her confidence, nothing effectual has been done. Let it then not be said that Dr. H's tactics have been successful, (we do not use the term in a disrespectful sense,) he has throughout *fought for time*—he fought for

* "I do not object to the expression of feelings on the part of individuals, however unjustifiable I may consider them. What I wish to call your Grace's attention to is, the circumstance of the University having taken upon itself the censorship of theological opinions, without any authority, as I conceive, for so doing by its statutes, or by the law of the land." Dr. Hampden's Letter to the Chancellor of the University.

it week after week last term at the board of Heads of Houses—he fought for it by his faithful friends and servants the late Proctors; but let him be taught that he has utterly miscalculated his chances, and that we did not engage in this distasteful and arduous controversy without fully reckoning the costs.

And oh! happy will it be for the Church, and more especially for the University, when these painful discussions shall have ceased. That end is to be brought about, not by compromise of principle, (for such never was the foundation of a lasting peace) not by an unsteady and wavering line of conduct, but by zeal united with charity, and a vigorous exertion accompanied by Christian forbearance. Our duty will then only be rightly regarded, when setting aside sectarian feeling on the one hand, and personal considerations on the other, we gird up our loins to the fight, in humble reliance on that power who can overrule for good, the most wayward purposes of man, who can say to the troubled sea be still, and who can alone guide us in safety to that haven of peace and quiet where we would all be. Acting on such principles and contending with such dispositions we shall be enabled to look back with mixed pain and gratification on the proceedings of the present time—with pain that the unity of the Church should have been endangered—and with gratification that amidst all the mortifications and obloquy to which we were

exposed, we did not act otherwise than as became men and Christians contending, not for party or personal pre-eminence; but for a grand, a vital, and an all-important *principle.*

THE END.

VINCENT, PRINTER, OXFORD.

10

A

NON-RESIDENT M.A.'s

SELF-VINDICATION

FOR

ATTENDING TO SUPPORT THE VOTE OF CENSURE

ON

DR. HAMPDEN'S WRITINGS.

OXFORD,
PRINTED BY W. BAXTER:
SOLD BY J. H. PARKER; AND BY MESSRS. RIVINGTON,
LONDON.
1836.

I AM one of the three hundred non-resident Members of Convocation, who went up to Oxford a few weeks ago to testify their disapprobation of the principles contained in Dr. Hampden's writings. I went fully prepared for the cry of Bigotry and Intolerance which I knew would be raised against us, and which has accordingly been raised with no sparing voice. This, of course, I give no heed to; except so far as the nature and the authors of the cry are such as to confirm my conviction, that the course we took was a right one. Next to the approbation of Christian friends, nothing is more encouraging than the censures of unchristian adversaries. I find, however, that some whose good opinion I value, and whom I should be sorry to leave with erroneous impressions on the subject, are not quite clear as to the imperative necessity of the line we have taken. Not knowing the momentous importance of the matter at issue, they are surprised that in times like these we should choose (as it appears

to them) to interrupt the peace and harmony of the University. Misinformed as to the extent of Dr. Hampden's errors, they wonder that we should expose ourselves to the charge of acting with unkindness and harshness to an individual; and having heard a few popular and plausible objections started to our line of proceeding, they have suffered them to grow in their minds, instead of doing us the justice to enquire into their truth and propriety. It is to such persons that I address these few lines, in justification of what we have already done, and of what we intend hereafter to do.

1. I find it objected to us, that whereas Dr. H. published his opinions several years ago, it is only now, on his appointment to the Regius Professorship that they have been raked up against him. "If," say they, "these doctrines are really false and dangerous, they ought to have been denounced long ago, and not brought forward now to serve a particular purpose." But surely even were it true to the letter that the resident portion of the University had so neglected their duty as to suffer these doctrines to remain for a long time unexposed and unrefuted, are they therefore never to say a word against them hereafter? Is there any statute of limitations to protect the growth of spurious Theology? What is the term of years through which, if

a dangerous book can creep unobserved, it is thenceforth to command respect and defy censure? But the alleged ground of this objection is not strictly true. I am informed that, immediately after the publication of Dr. H's Lectures, their unsound and destructive contents were freely commented on in private conversation: they did not however attract general attention; they took no hold whatever of the public mind: and it was concluded, with apparent justice, that it would be a needless waste of time to attack opinions which nobody was in danger of being misled by; that controversy might only tend to enliven and render attractive opinions which in themselves, and in the mode of setting them forth, were hitherto as dull and repulsive as could be desired; and that therefore the best course was to let them go their way quietly down

——in vicum vendentem thus et odores
Et piper, et quidquid chartis amicitur ineptis.

Moreover, more than a year ago there was published a pamphlet, entitled "The Foundations of the Faith assailed at Oxford," addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury as our Visitor, in which the attention of the University and the Church at large was invited to the peculiar views of Dr. Hampden. In short, he has most undoubtedly for some time past, been looked on with suspicion as an unsound

Theologian: and if from a love of peace or from private considerations those who knew his errors have held on with him till the very last moment, till silence became a sinful consent, is their temporary forbearance to be now brought against them? Are they never to be allowed an opportunity of atoning for their remissness, if remissness it were not to withdraw from him the first instant they found him "teaching otherwise, and not consenting to wholesome words?"

After all, if there were any force in this objection, it would only apply to the resident members, who heard or who read the statements in question; or rather to those only who by station or character might be expected to expose and confute them. Let them make their own defence as best they may. It does not affect the non-residents, whose duty it is to use their votes in defence of the sacred cause of truth *as soon as* they are informed of the danger, and allowed an opportunity of acting.

But, 2dly, it is generally objected to us, especially by such as are predisposed in Dr. H's favour, "He is a Professor already. You made him one a very short time since." Not *we*—a majority did so out of six electors who in no sense represent the University; but we had no control over their choice, which was besides a matter

of comparative insignificance. Any one with three years experience of Oxford knows the immense difference between a Professor of Moral Philosophy, and the Regius Professor of Divinity—the one almost a sinecurist, the other the most important, the most prominent, the most responsible officer in the University!—between a Professor whose public Lectures are heard once a term by a few idle M.A.s and stray undergraduates, unless indeed the walls have the sole and undivided benefit of them—and a Professor whose Lectures have hitherto been attended by all the students in Theology, to whom they have served as an outline to be filled up by their future studies—a standard by which their religious views have been fixed and regulated—a chart by which they have been taught to steer clear of the rocks and shoals of Theological reading. To most of us the Divinity Lectures were our last gift from the University, at a time when we were most disposed to receive deep impressions, on our taking leave of the state of pupillage, and having soon to teach others what we had learnt ourselves. Surely this is an office in which soundness of principle, devotion of heart, and depth and extent and accuracy of learning, must, by God's blessing, be most widely and permanently beneficial to His Church: and in which, on the other hand, an unsound, superficial, wavering, double-minded person cannot fail of doing the greatest mischief.

Philosophers must and will have some material for curious novelties and ingenious speculation. Let them confine themselves to discussing heathen ethics, and constructing hypothetical schemes of morality of their own. Dr. H. could do comparatively little harm, while he travestied Butler and developed Epicurus to the few who chose to listen to him, but was not for a moment to be trusted where a whole University *must* sit at his feet to receive his impressions of Divine truth. "A cow," as Dr. Johnson has observed, "is a very good animal in a field, but we turn her out of a garden." Can it be a matter of surprise, that the same men who silently tolerated Dr. Hampden's solitary browsings in the wide field of Moral Philosophy, should protest against his breaking into the sacred garden of Divinity, where we know too well that he will begin at once to trample under foot its most carefully maintained fences, and its most precious borders?

But, 3dly, it is said, "After all, it is a mere question of words, and names, and Theological speculations, about which if Dr. Hampden does not quite agree with you, why cannot you bear with him quietly, and discuss the matter with him in a friendly manner, instead of trying to cry him down with this summary condemnation?"

Now I can quite conceive, that people, who are not actually engaged in studying or teaching Theology, may sometimes be surprised at the

stress laid on certain questions, of which it requires a more practised eye than theirs to see the full bearings, and appreciate the infinite importance: and therefore I am not surprised at some even serious right-minded persons wondering at our strenuousness on the present occasion. But I must entreat all such persons to give us credit for being engaged in a contest of much more than mere names and words: I must assure them, that the very foundations of our faith are assailed: I must beg them to believe the truth of what I am going to say; namely, that men of the highest reputation in the University for talents, piety, and Theological acquirements, have examined the writings of Dr. H. carefully and dispassionately, and found them to be full of contradictions to the very truths, which by his ordination vows he is pledged to maintain: they have found in them strong reasons to conclude, that he has been led away by a false philosophy too closely resembling that of the German rationalists: they have found but too many instances of the most irreverent and depreciating manner of speaking of our Creeds and Articles, the Sacraments, and all the mysteries of our holy faith: and they apprehend that the tendency of his principles must be to encourage the levelling latitudinarianism of the present day, to foster a spirit of self-confidence and rash judgment, and thus to pave the way to Soci-

nianism and other more avowed forms of Infidelity. This, I say, is the true case against Dr. H, made out after the most careful investigation; not from isolated passages only, but from the universal tenor of his writings. I shall not now subjoin any specimens or extracts from them to prove this charge: if it is false, it can easily be refuted; if any are seriously anxious to ascertain the truth of it for themselves, they have only to send to any bookseller for the pamphlets which have appeared on the subject: but, if it be true, does it not follow that this is a matter which admits not of dallying and quiet conferring, but which calls for speedy and decisive measures of condemnation? The religious principles of the University are at stake: the youth of the University are in immediate danger of being corrupted: our love of peace must give way to our still more sacred obligation to the cause of truth: and the courtesies of common life are only so far to be regarded as they are consistent with our duty to "contend for the faith once delivered to the saints."

4. Another objection, that it was a *personal* business, can, of course, in the nature of things, only be aimed at a few; as one man cannot come into any thing like personal collision with many. For my own part, I can truly say, that when I got off the coach at Oxford, I had never seen Dr. Hampden in my life; and this must be the

case with most of the non-residents. But I have every reason to believe, that those residents who are most conspicuous in their opposition to his opinions, are not the kind of men to indulge in personal animosities. Every question, however Christianly and prudently agitated, may still be charged with personality, by those who are minded to regard it as such. We live in a world of *persons*. We are all *persons*, and have *persons* to deal with. Truth is committed to the care of *persons*, who when they defend it from the manifold aggressions of error, have something more than abstractions to cope with, and still find they have *persons* for their antagonists.

Moreover it must needs happen, that in the many vicissitudes of our holy warfare, the foremost maintainers of truth and error, and of good and evil principles, are again and again brought into something like hostile collision. As the spheres of individuals enlarge and new occasions occur, so each renewed encounter, be the cause ever so legitimate and the stake ever so sacred, may still be malignantly construed into the remnant of some former feud. Men become personifications, as it were, of the views they advocate and represent: and while the more spiritual discerners see this world and this world's conflicts to be but the visible field of that fight, wherein the causes, the guidance, the aids, and the prizes, are all of heaven; men of grosser

apprehensions rest their eyes on the outward shape and present circumstances of that unseen struggle.

The 5th objection seems to be, that it was a *party* business. To this I answer, *What* party? Look at the Record and the British Magazine. Are they of the same party? Are they likely to agree on any one point if they can possibly help it? Look through the list of names affixed to the various documents. You will find there specimens of the highest of what are termed High Churchmen, and the lowest of those who are designated the Low Church. But, I assert, the *main* body of Dr. Hampden's opponents are precisely those who are least likely to be influenced by party feelings; they are men, who, disclaiming any particular name, cognizance, or leader, seek only to be good Churchmen in the most sacred sense of the word. They are men whose hearts' desire and prayer is that the Gospel may be preached and received as free from human adulterations as can possibly be, and that the Church may be brought more and more to her primitive purity of Doctrine and Discipline; but who, believing that Dr. Hampden's principles would tend to results the most opposite to these, feel it their duty zealously and stedfastly to oppose them.

I pass to objection the 6th, That it was a *political* business.

If this means that our proceedings may by some persons be viewed politically, or connected and even mixed up with political questions, of course *I* cannot answer for the religious single-mindedness of every one who went up to vote, nor should I think any one could be utterly unconscious of the possibility of political consequences. Unfortunately in these days of excitement, politics, like the frogs in Egypt, are a plague which penetrates to our beds, or ovens, and our kneading troughs. I will not pretend to be certain, that all who met in Oxford are as wholly uninfluenced by political motives as myself, who am perfectly guiltless of ever having given a political vote, or attended a political meeting: but this I have every reason to believe, that, generally speaking, it was religious principle, and not political excitement, which called us forth, and that all worldly considerations were merged in our apprehensions of the danger which we saw impending over the present fortunes of the Church of Christ. We were not so simple as not to be aware, that had a desire to embarrass Lord Melbourne's administration been our object, the step we were taking would rather tend to defeat than advance our purposes: and that the more we objected to his appointments, the greater would be his credit for relentless liberality among the people at large. But, in fact, no such plan, to the best of my knowledge,

ever entered our minds. I never remember a question conducted so simply on its own merits. The material on which we were called to decide was certain published statements: the *character* or *motives* or movements of the author, or of his friends, or of his political patron, were all utterly irrelevant considerations; I am sure that none openly mixed them up with the religious question before us; and no one can fairly say that ours was a political movement, unless he can prove, that every individual of those 400, who were ready to vote on our side, was probably a hypocrite to all the rest. Lord Melbourne, I think, was generally considered to have acted somewhat in the dark. Had he given us a Professor with the most negative recommendations, we should have taken no more notice of his appointment than of the promotion of Dr. Longley, or of Mr. O'Connell's reported nominee. I may or may not be correct in this estimate of the feelings and motives of so large a body of men; but to me it seems neither fair nor reasonable to imagine, that they were other than those which were expressed in their words, and which fully accounted for their actions.

7. And, lastly, it is objected to us that this is *persecution*. I was quite prepared for this, knowing that Dr. H. would be immediately held up to the compassion of the world as a poor persecuted martyr, and ourselves to

its reprobation as furious bigots. The World is a system of counterfeits, and loves to have its martyrs as well as the Church. It appreciates too well the vivid and enduring testimony of suffering saints, to lose any opportunity of making out something like it, on its own side of the question. I confess, however, that I did not expect to find any one of Dr. H's station in the University condescending to minister to the delusion: I did not expect to find that he had begun his course of public instruction with so awful a perversion of our Lord's own words, as that which appears in his Inaugural Lecture—that he had dared to quote in reference to himself, when called solemnly to account for his doctrinal errors by his brother ministers, a text which our Saviour designed for a consolation to His Apostles, when suffering under the violence of the Jew and the insult of the Greek—that he had ventured to insinuate, that to his situation apply the words, "Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you!" Let him reflect whether they would not better apply to warn him against the approbation of the profane and thoughtless multitude, than to console him under the loss of the confidence of his Brethren in Christ.

But let us see how the matter really stands.

The persecution of Dr. H., if such there

be, must consist either in the *steps* themselves we have taken, or in the *manner* in which they are taken. For the first, we have only acted in a defensive, or rather protective, capacity. We designed simply to pass an act of censure on Dr. H's published opinions, that the unwary youth of Oxford might not fall into them through mere inadvertence and ignorance: and to place in trustworthy hands during his possession of the Professorship certain offices which do not necessarily belong to it; and which we could not suffer him to discharge consistently with our sworn duty to the University. Convocation had annexed these functions to the Professorship, not to augment the power and dignity of that office, but with a view to the general benefit of the Church: on that same view it became now our duty to suspend powers which we were morally certain would be abused. We do not wish to interfere with Dr. H's comforts, or to meddle with his emoluments. Is this persecution? I cannot understand why it should be thought so. When a man is thrust into an office for which every one connected with that office judges him utterly unfit, I do not think it persecution openly and fairly to object to his appointment. A man in a public station becomes public property, and people have a right to enquire whether his character is

such as they can place confidence in. His defects, whether of judgment, principles, or abilities, which, in a private station, could have concerned none but himself, become open to the censure of those, who feel that the body to which they belong may be disgraced or injured by them. We claim the liberty of doing this, and no more than this, with respect to Dr. H. and we do not think, that he has any right in consequence of it to throw himself on the protection of the public as a persecuted individual. With respect to the manner in which we have done it, I will only say, that I came up under some degree of apprehension, lest in the warmth of the moment my friends might have been betrayed into harsh expressions, and breaches of the strict rule of meekness and charity: and I was struck with the fact, and I cannot but attribute it to the especial grace of God controlling their hearts, that there was nothing of the kind whatever to object to; that, on the contrary, there had been throughout, in the many conferences held, and the many writings published, a remarkable freedom from all theological acerbity; no rash attribution of bad motives, no unkind stories raked up, no perversion of words or misrepresentation of facts; every care taken to screen Dr. H.'s personal character from the least imputation; and due credit given him for perfect sincerity of purpose, so as to

make it evident throughout, that our attack was directed not against the man, but against his errors[n].

To conclude, I hope I have satisfactorily shewn, that in what we have been obliged to do in this unfortunate business, there has been nothing unkind, unjust, or unnecessary; that so

[n] I subjoin an extract from Martin Luther's Table Talk, which will shew that Dr. H. may consider himself fortunate that he has to deal with Oxonians of the nineteenth century, and not with a German Reformer of the sixteenth.

"Anno 1543, Nov. 8. Gaspar Schwenkfield sent one of his books to Luther, whereupon Luther brake out with fervent zeal and said, "Schwenkfield is a silly creature, "qui non habet ingenium, nec spiritum, sed est attonitus," as all seducers are. He knoweth not what he babbleth.... A little child goeth plainly to work, and saith, I believe in Jesus Christ our Lord, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost &c. but this idiot, this fantastical gentleman, hath filched certain words out of my book, therewith the fellow will trim himself: he mingleth my phrases with his own, and sets it forth as if it were all my meaning. He will teach me what Christ is, and how I shall worship Him: I have, God be praised, better learnt it than he; let him trouble me no more." Then spake Dr. Roper to Luther, and said, "Oh sir, that is somewhat too harsh:" Luther answered him, "Such fellows teach me to be harsh; we must talk so with the Devil. Let Schwenkfield, by public writing, revoke that heresy about the Sacrament, and bring me testimony from Dr. Hessey, and Dr. Moibane, otherwise, said Luther, I will not believe him, though he sware unto me."

far from our conduct having been a departure from Christian principles, it was a sense of duty alone which compelled us to overlook our own private feelings, and brave the opinion of the world around us. Most solemnly do I reply to the charge, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?" "I have not troubled Israel, but those, who have forsaken the Lord, and have followed Baalim."

How the matter will end, I cannot conjecture.

One thing is quite clear, that Dr. H. never can recover the confidence of the University, at least not sufficiently so as to be qualified for his present office. Is there a single clergyman or gentleman in the country, who would choose to send his son to a clergyman of Dr. H.'s opinions, to prepare him for Orders? and if so, can Dr. H. be a fit person to preside over the religious education of near half the clergy of England? How Dr. H., holding the opinions he does, can continue in the Church, I cannot conceive: speaking as he does of her Creeds, her Articles, and her Sacraments, and yet continuing in her communion and eating of her bread. But will he, can he, after what has passed, continue in his Professorship? will he, safe under the shelter of the law, go on despising the united voices of the University and Clergy at large, as an idle clamour; and our deep convictions of his unfitness, as an empty prejudice?

Can he bear to think, that while union is so desirable at the present moment, he should be the principal ingredient of discord? that while the friends of pure religion are preparing to resist the unhallowed inroads of philosophy and neology, which threaten them on every side, the enemies of our faith should be looking to him as their friend in the citadel, who is to open the gates to them? that while every day our students in Divinity are increasing in attachment to the real religion of our Church, as set forth in her confessions of faith, he should be foremost in leading them to undervalue those sacred bulwarks, and to set up their own private judgment in preference to the universal consent of the Church, and the wisdom of antiquity? Oh how infinitely should I prefer the obscurest poverty, to wealth, and fame, and the applause of the multitude so dearly purchased!

While writing these lines, I have received notice that the question will shortly be brought forward again. God willing, I shall be at my post, and I trust that all who can, will be there likewise. Meanwhile, I commit the matter to Him, to whom, in times of difficulty and danger, we may always confidently look for light, for strength, and for protection. May these be granted us on the present occasion! If in any point we have departed from the strict rule of humility and

Christian love, may we as we proceed be made wiser, and more watchful! May this sad affair be the means of uniting all the really faithful servants of Christ more closely together, and thus be overruled to our good and His glory!

THE END.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.

DOES

DR. HAMPDEN'S

INAUGURAL LECTURE

IMPLY ANY CHANGE

IN HIS

THEOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES?

A LETTER

FROM THE

REV. C. R. CAMERON, M.A.
OF CHRIST CHURCH,

TO

A RESIDENT MEMBER OF CONVOCATION.

OXFORD,
PRINTED BY W. BAXTER:
SOLD BY J. H. PARKER; AND BY MESSRS. RIVINGTON,
LONDON.
1836.

The individual, to whom the following Letter is addressed, has thought it right to use the permission therein given, to make it public, as believing the Letter to furnish new elements for consideration in the present momentous question. The assumed soundness of Dr. Hampden's Parochial Sermons namely, has been the chief argument of his supporters; and although individuals *have examined them, and declared their conviction of their unsoundness, still it has generally been thought a conciser answer to say, that their soundness or unsoundness does not at all affect the question;—that a man's popular religious teaching might be sound, while his theological teaching was much otherwise. For instance, even an Arian, unless through wantonness, need not, in popular religious teaching, discover his unsoundness except negatively. This waving of the question, however, has been taken as a concession; and the Edinburgh Review, for instance, taunts (though untruly) those who object to Dr. H.'s appointment with "taking good care not to notice the Parochial Sermons." These persons may see another answer in this Letter. But the light which it throws on the Inaugural Lecture appeared of most moment; in that it shews how to an individual aloof from controversy, and (as all will allow) dispassionately seeking after truth, the Inaugural Lecture, and the Parochial Sermons, evidence the same theological system as the Bampton Lectures, differing in form only. It furnishes also a warning much needed in this day, with regard to certain foreign publications, not to be over-hasty in concluding a work to be sound, because sound language is occasionally used in it.*

Snedshill, Shiffnal, April 29, 1836.

MY DEAR SIR,

Having discovered, even while in Oxford, and still more since my return into the country, that Dr. Hampden's Inaugural Lecture had made a considerable impression on the minds of many, and, to use a favourite modern phrase, had produced a reaction in his favour, some having gone so far as to assert, with himself, that he is a persecuted man; I set myself seriously to consider—are there just and solid grounds for such a change of opinions, and for these favourable sentiments? For if there be, in the name of Peace and Charity, let the contest cease; let all lurking fears and suspicions be at once cast aside, and Dr. H. be received with open arms by the University and the Church. It is indeed impossible not to feel, that the necessity laid upon the Members of the University, to engage in hostilities against one, who, in private life, is reported to be so amiable as Dr. H. and apparently so much under the influence of practical religious principle, is most painful. The contest, however, is far too important in itself, and involves consequences far too momentous, to be hastily abandoned on the first plausible professions. Let it be admitted, that Dr. H.'s Inaugural Lecture is written in a pleasing, popular style; that it is apparently sound, orthodox, and even, as I have heard it called, evangelical, agreeing both with Scripture, and the scriptural statements of the Church of England. Still the question naturally occurs, does the Inaugural Lecture contain Dr. H.'s second thoughts—his last views—his reconsidered judgment—his final conclusions—upon the important topics to which he adverts? And may the University safely rest in that Lecture, as decisive authority for the course of instruction to be pursued by Dr. H. as Divinity Professor? Two or three considerations will furnish us with the true answer to

these questions; and, for various reasons, I submit these considerations to you, to make what use you please of them.

I. Is there any evidence to be derived from Dr. H.'s former writings, which may throw light upon this question? Dr. H. published in 1828 "Parochial Sermons*." I have anxiously examined these, and I find in them the same popular, Church of England, Scriptural language, as appears in the Inaugural Lecture. But in what sense is it used? The Sermons are a *systematic* and laboured attempt to reconcile the common language of Christians, whether learned or unlearned, with Dr. H.'s own peculiar views and opinions, as detailed at large in his Bampton Lectures, i. e. to explain away the meaning usually attached to that language by the Christian world at large. Thus, while using the ordinary terms of Theology relating to these subjects, Dr. H. explains away the reality of the sacrifice and atonement of Christ; the doctrine of justification by faith; the regenerating and sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, as producing any actual internal change of heart and nature. And if I may hazard any positive inferences from such obscure and ambiguous statements, I should say his doctrine is, that by the "redemption which is in Christ" we are negatively justified, merely placed in a condition of "working out our own salvation;" that justification and sanctification are the same thing; and that they are effected by a simple knowledge and belief (which is all he means by faith) of the *facts* which the Scriptures communicate, operating through the ordinary and natural principles of the human mind. "Ex pede Herculem!" The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is, that the statements of the Inaugural Lecture are *not* the reconsidered views, the final judgment, of Dr. H. on the important truths in question, but

* I cannot quote at length; but must refer generally to the Parochial Sermons.

merely the course and colouring which his thoughts and expressions naturally and almost unavoidably assume, when speaking or writing in a loose, general, and popular way, but are really and uniformly understood and used by him (and so to be understood by us) in his own peculiar sense. How the apparent inconsistencies came originally to exist in his mind, has been explained by yourself in the Preface to "Dr. H.'s Theological Statements and the Thirty-nine Articles compared [b];" that he has found out a way of reconciling these inconsistencies to himself, a mere inspection of the Parochial Sermons shews.

II. Does Dr. H. *profess*, in his Inaugural Lecture, to give any explanation of his former obnoxious statements? Does he retract or withdraw any one single expression he had before used? or make any attempt to shew that there is no inconsistency between the views developed in the Bampton Lectures, and his present statements? Quite the reverse. He refers (p. 9, &c.) to his former thoughts and writings on "theological subjects"—his "speculative discussions;" but instead of retractation, there is a distinct and explicit reavowal of his former statements; he merely intimates that he may be liable to "misinterpretation, misconception," and "misunderstanding;" and more than intimates, that the inconsistencies imputed to him are to be ascribed to "the perverse sense which has been drawn from" his words, and that the objectors, not the writer, are to blame. He complains also of "the vague nature" of the charges brought against him, and of insinuations of "heterodoxy, latitudinarianism," and "scepticism;" but he makes no attempt to expose the sophistry of his opponents, or rebut the charges advanced by them, unless an attack on their prejudices and the density of their understandings, is to be taken

[b] To this work, and "Dr. Hampden's Past and Present Statements compared," the reader is referred for a fuller exposition of the facts and arguments of the case.

as a reply. As he himself, however, deals only in vague generalities and mere suppositions, his reply may be retorted on himself. In truth, his whole vindication of himself is an *argumentum ad misericordiam;* and without calling in question the good intentions to which he appeals, it is obvious to ask, Is the language of his Inaugural Lecture, the language of a man convinced that he has been in error, desirous of repairing any mischief he may be supposed to have done by "the recondite track of observation pursued" by him, or anxious to convince objectors that he will for the future abstain from pursuing this obnoxious and dangerous track? If these questions must be answered in the negative, then is Dr. H.'s position no-wise bettered by the publication of his Inaugural Lecture; and he has proved himself unfit for the due discharge of the most important duties of the Divinity Chair in Oxford.

III. One other question remains to be asked. In what sense are we to understand the statements of Scriptural truth—the words and expressions made use of in the Inaugural Lecture? Are we to understand them in their usual acceptation, in the sense which Christians in general attach to them? Is this the sense in which Dr. H. himself understands them? He himself tells us *no.* He disclaims none of his former statements, nor gives the slightest intimation that he there uses his words in a sense different from his former usage. What, indeed, is one grand object of his Bampton Lectures? It is to shew, that *those terms of our Religion which an established usage has now made the unchangeable records of religious belief*, are to be *traced in the Aristotelic Theories of Scholasticism;* that they have spread *an atmosphere of mist over the whole system of Christian doctrine;* that the *Christianity which survives among us at this day is speculative logical Christianity*, consisting of mere *phantoms—of signs converted into things*, and forming altogether a *vast system of Realism;* accordingly Dr. H. substitutes for

the received notions, his own definitions of the chief fundamental doctrines of Christianity. In what sense then are we to understand the language of the Inaugural Lecture? In the sense to which Dr. H. uniformly objects, or in his own sense? We must answer, in his own sense; and if in his own sense, then not in the common acceptation of the terms as understood by the Church of England, and the Christian world in general, but in that novel speculative sense to which such strong objections have so justly been made. How then has the publication of the Inaugural Lecture altered the real state of the case? If Dr. H.'s former statements and opinions rendered him unfit for the proper duties of the Divinity Chair; he has now proved himself still more unfit, by proving that he abides by all his former statements despite of the grave objections advanced against them, and will not let them go; "non demptus per vim mentis gratissimus error." If indeed, according to his own showing, Dr. H.'s arguments and opinions are so unintelligible, so open to misconstruction, and are so easily and naturally understood in an erroneous and dangerous sense, is he fitted to be a teacher and guide in Theology to the future ministers of our Church? And have we any security, or even the shadow of a presumption, that the Theology of the Bampton Lectures will not, as far as Dr. H.'s teaching is concerned, become the standard Theology of the University and the Church? Let it also be ever borne in mind, that his opinions do not affect mere isolated points of doctrine, but the whole system of our religious faith;—the whole interpretation of Scripture, and the modes of expression, acquiesced in and adopted by the universal Church from the beginning. One word more; Dr. H. comforts himself with the declaration of our Saviour, "Blessed are ye when men shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake." Is Dr. H. then indeed persecuted for Christ's sake? Is not the charge against him of the very opposite

character? Is it not grounded upon the persuasion, that his opinions and statements are calculated to degrade (not to exalt too highly) the Nature and dignity of the Redeemer; and to disparage and destroy the reality and efficacy of His Sacrifice and Atonement? And yet he would have it believed, that he is suffering for the honour of *Him* whom he is accused of dishonouring! I will not trust myself to characterize, as I feel, presumption such as this. May the fearful conflict which must be carried on in Dr. H.'s own mind, between "the philosophical system admitted into the intellect" and the practical principles of the heart, terminate in the triumph of truth, and faith, and piety! But let others be preserved, as far as is possible, from the risks of so perilous a struggle, and from the tremendous consequences which, as members of the Church of England and as Christians, we must believe are suspended on the issue!

Believe me, my dear Sir,

Your's very truly,

C. R. CAMERON.

BAXTER, PRINTER, OXFORD.